Theological Magazine

OF THE

EVANGELICAL SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA

Volume 62 November, 1934 Number 6

Motto: 1. Cor. 3, 22-23.
Πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν, ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY

Published bi-monthly and entered at the post office at Saint Louis, Missouri, as second-class matter in December, 1898.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October, 1917, authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS

PAGE

Evangelical and Reformed, Dr. Geo. W. Richards 402
From Liberalism to Realism, R. C. Stanger 410
Decision Confronting the Church, P. L. Lehmann 419
Luther als Erzieher. Dr. H. Werdermann 427
Bekenntnis der neuen Kirche. Dr. G. F. Schuetze 435
Editorials 443
Christian World 451
Book Review 466

Theological Magazine

of the

Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per copy (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 1956 W. Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-24 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Missouri.

Vol. 62 St. Louis, Mo. Nov. 1

Last Issue of the Theological Magazine

The General Conference of the Evangelical Synod of North America, in session in Cincinnati, Ohio, October, 1933, passed the following resolution:

"The General Conference orders the revision of the "Theological Magazine' from its present form, and asks the Board of Publication to request the faculty of Eden Seminary and others who are qualified to undertake the development of a Theological Journal which will more fully serve the purpose of such a publication."

The matter was referred to the faculty of Eden Seminary with the result that the Theological Magazine will be discontinued pending the publication of some other Journal. We quote from their letter:

"After careful consideration of the various angles involved the faculty came to the conclusion that the merger with the Reformed Church so vitally affects this question that a new situation has been created. The faculty is of the opinion that under present conditions it would not be desirable to continue with the publication of the Magazine and inclines to look forward to the founding of a new Journal which may more adequately care for the needs of the united church. The consummation of this hope rests with the future."

Eden Publishing House will be glad to apply any 1935 advance payments on the Theological Magazine to any other subscription. Our readers will please give instructions accordingly.

G. E. Seybold, Circulation Manager.

CAN WE STILL BE EVANGELICAL AND REFORMED?

GEORGE W. RICHARDS, D.D., LL.D., D.TH.

I

The words 'evangelical' and 'reformed' came into current use in the Reformation of the sixteenth century. Luther and Zwingli, each from his own point of view and in his own way, protested against errors in doctrine and abuses in morals of the Roman Catholic Church—the Church in which they were baptized, confirmed, and ordained. They protested because they re-discovered the *evangel* or gospel, i.e., the glad tidings of God to men, recorded in the New Testament and especially as interpreted by Paul in his letters. On that account they were called 'evangelical' to distinguish them from the Roman Catholics on the one hand and from the humanists on the other.

In the light of the rediscovered gospel they felt that it was an absolute necessity to reform the Church. They did not desire to separate from, or to divide, the Church of their Fathers. But when they found out that the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church stubbornly resisted a re-formation according to the teachings of the New Testament, they were driven into schism and to reorganize the Church so as to correspond with the gospel which they discovered, experienced, and preached. The result was that Western Christianity was divided into two branches—Catholic and Protestant.

All Protestants at first were evangelical and their aim was the re-forming of the Church. But in the first generation of the reformation the leaders of protestantism differed from one another in their interpretation of the evangel of the New Testament, of the way of salvation, and of the method of reforming the Church. In consequence of these differences, Protestants were divided among themselves into Lutherans, Reformed, and Anabaptists. The first two were considered evangelical and set to work not to found a new church but to re-form the old Church. The Anabaptists, subdivided into numerous sects, were not recognized as evangelical in the same sense as the Lutherans and the Reformed; and their purpose was not to re-form the old Church but to found a church *de novo,* that is, a new church on the basis of the New Testament. Thus, the terms 'evangelical' and 'reformed' were originally applied only to the Lutheran and the Reformed Church.

When Luther and Zwingli separated at Marburg in 1529, the evangelical reformers became leaders of two different churches—the one named, after its leader, the Evanglical Lutheran Church;

and the other, named after the fact that it was re-formed according to God's word, the Evangelical Reformed Church. Both Churches were originally called in Latin *ecclesiae reformatae*—reformed churches, the 'reformed' word, however, began with a small letter. With the rise of two bodies, it became a proper name, was written with a capital "R", and applied to the Church led by Zwingli and Calvin, distinguishing it from the Lutheran and the Roman Catholic Church. Through four centuries both in Europe and America, these two Churches have been designated as 'evangelical'; Adolf Keller says in his last book, "a large part of the Protestants in Germany feel themselves to be simply Evangelical." Since both claim to be the Catholic Church re-formed, they also are in principle Reformed, though the Lutheran Church no longer bears that name. Indeed, to be evangelical the Church must constantly be re-formed in the light of the evangel. Otherwise it will revert to Catholicism or to humanism.

II

What is the distinctive and permanent characteristic of Evangelical Christianity, It is found in the answer of the Reformers to the eternal question, 'What must I do to be saved? The experience of justification by grace through faith wrought into doctrine and institutions became a church system not only different from, but also antagonistic to, Catholicism on the one hand and to humanism of every degree on the other. It was not simply Catholicism purified or modified, not merely a restoration of primitive Christianity; it was a distinctive interpretation of the gospel in a new age, which affected every part of the ecclesiastical order and of the Christian life. It could, therefore, survive and continue in history only when embodied in its own institutional forms. Paolo Sarpi saw clearly the farreaching significance of the doctrine of justification by faith when, in his History of the Council of Trent, he says: "All the errors of Martin were resolved into that one point—justification; for this denies the efficacy of the sacraments, the authority of priests, purgatory, the sacrifice of the mass, and all other remedies for the remission of sins. Therefore he that will establish the body of Catholic doctrine must first overthrow this heresy of justification by faith alone." In the modern age, accordingly, Christian history is divided into two parts—the history of Catholic and of Evangelical Christianity.

The Reformation was born out of a sense of need, the old human need felt in a new way in the dawn of a new age. It was the soul's need for God. The prophets and psalmists, the apostles and fathers felt and uttered it long before. Time came when men's eyes were dimmed and their ears dulled, and they saw and heard

God only afar off. But men will not be satisfied with an absent God. The heart asserts itself and cries out for the living God. A revival of religion usually follows a season of drought and dearth and men find their way back to the Father's house. Such an awakening manifests itself in a profound sense of need, of the littleness of man and of the greatness of God, of the sinfulness of man and of the righteousness of Good, of the guilt of man and of the grace of God. Stated in untheological language it sounds something as follows: How can a man be true, honest, and severe toward himself and yet be happy and hopeful? Only when above his helplessness and guilt he beholds One greater than himself—the pardoning love of God in which he finds joy and peace, and which constrains him to live in love, forbearance, and forgiveness among his fellows.

This was in substance the experience of the Reformers. When their church failed to satisfy their need, they were driven to protest and to separation. They heard a new answer to the cry of the soul and founded a new church, or, perhaps better, re-formed the old Church, to preserve and propagate the new discovery.

At this point the Reformers differed fundamentally from the Humanists. The one had a deep feeling of man's insufficiency and his dependence upon God. The other had a proud sense of man's self-sufficiency and his independence of God. The Reformation was essentially a religious movement and was led by prophets; humanism was essentially a philosophical and æsthetic movement and was led by scholars and artists. The Reformers left the Catholic Church because it failed to satisfy their religious needs. The Humanists ignored or tolerated the Catholic Church because they had no serious religious needs to satisfy. The Reformers felt the need of a savior because they were helpless; the Humanists felt no need of a savior because they could save themselves. They were content with a teacher and an example who helped them to save themselves. The one group could not, without self-stultification, remain in the Catholic Church; the other group, to save themselves from irksome annoyances, readily acquiesced in the established ecclesiastical order but lived their lives unhampered by its laws.

The need felt by the Reformers was primarily religious, not intellectual or moral, not political or æsthetic. It had to do with man's relation to God; his relation to man and to the world was a necessary consequence of his relation to God. Men felt in a new way the need of providence, the need of grace, the need of truth or way of life.

In the face of a universe with forces that devastated and destroy and of the ills of the individual and the social life, some running as poison in the blood, some floating as miasma in the air, God needs to be justified before men as much as men need to be justified be-

fore God. The one is the perpetual problem of theodicy, the other of soteriology. The solution was discovered by the Reformers not in ancient philosophy, in stoical defiance, in cynical scorn, in epicurean indifference, or in skeptical negations, but in childlike trust in a Christlike God who upholds and controls matter and mind throughout the universe for the ultimate establishment of the kingdom of holy love. God is justified before men by faith in divine providence—in infinite power working with infinite love.

Men came to have a new sense of the need of grace as they felt more keenly the guilt of sin in the light of the love of God in Christ. In one form or another men always felt the power of sin when the conscience of man was sensitized by the Scripture and the Scripture became more meaningful when the sinner read it to find deliverance from sin. The return of the Reformers to the Bible and to Jesus Christ increased their sense of sin and guilt and inspired hope of salvation. For Jesus in his holiness abased men to the dust; by his grace he exalted men to the heavens. In vain did they try the devices of men to rid themselves of sin,—by ignoring it, by doing penance for it, by forgetting it. Not even the Catholic Church, with her sacramental guarantees of grace and with her claims of divine authority, could give men the assurance of pardon, the certitude of salvation which the awakened conscience demands. The Reformers found the only satisfactory way to peace and that was the way of forgiveness through the free grace of God revealed in Christ Jesus appropriated by faith. Thus men were again on friendly terms with God, were convinced that they were sons of God and heirs of eternity. Now they could share the triumphal cry of the apostle:

"Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus" (Romans 8: 37-39).

When men lived in new fellowship with God, they had the dynamic of a new age. They became just by grace through faith. Men felt the need not only of divine grace for the sinner but of a divine life for the saved. They had followed the traditions of the Church, the example of prophets and priests, of sages and saints, the light of reason, the promptings of conscience, but all these were blind guides leading the blind. They felt the need of a Lord and Master as much as of a Savior; of one who could say: "I am the way, the truth, and the life"; the way to God, the truth of God, and the life in God. They found him in Scripture in the son of Mary and the Son of God.

The essence, then, of Evangelical Christianity, the substance of the gospel of the Reformers which revived Christianity and renewed the Western world, was the good news of divine providence, divine grace, divine life, revealed in Jesus Christ and appropriated by men through faith working in love. The answer to the threefold need of the soul they found, not in an institution with infallible dogmas and laws—not in the official and sacramental Church; not in reliance on the intellect and will of man—not in humanism; but in the Christ of the New Testament who showed them a God of love who provides, a God of grace who forgives, and a God of truth who guides. Once having found Christ and direct access to God, they could no longer be Roman Catholics, they could not become Humanists; they had to become Evangelicals because they had an *evangel*—glad tidings, saved by grace, the kingdom of God is at hand.

There is a wide difference between Evangelicals on the one hand and Catholics and Humanists on the other. The one makes the Christian life the result of salvation, the other the condition of salvation. The Catholic becomes a servant trying to earn salvation, the Humanist a lord denying the need of salvation, the Evangelical a child inheriting salvation. The life of each is controlled by different motives and has different ethical values.

III

The Renaissance was the re-discovery of man; the Reformation was the re-discovery of God. These discoveries mark the end of the Middle Age and the beginning of the Modern Age. There were reformers centuries before the Reformation and humanists centuries before the Renaissance. Only in the 15th and 16th centuries did the ideals of Reformers and Humanists become dominant and a new age was born out of the old. Men went back in order to go forward—back to the New Testament and the Greek and Roman classics, the ideals of which began to shape the expanding life of modern Europe.

We are told that we have reached the "End of an Era" or "the End of our Time." A new age, perhaps as different from the passing modern age as that age differed from the Middle Age, is said to be in process of birth, or, perchance, in its infancy. Men are now disposed, as they were then, to turn away from the controlling ideals of the passing age and to follow ways of their own devising—ways presumably more scientific, more political and economic, more adapted to the nature and the needs of the modern man. They forsake traditional humanism and evangelicalism, medieval Catholicism and original Protestantism. Some have modified and modernized the faith of the Fathers to such an extent that it has

been devitalized and de-Christianized. Others are not content with modification; they insist on renouncing and denouncing not only the evangel of the Reformers but the idealism of the Humanists because both are assumed to be equally harmful and hostile to human welfare.

Many strange messiahs and messianic kingdoms are now proclaimed with all the enthusiasm of ancient prophecy. There is the excessive collectivism of Marxian communism, the excessive individualism of the Nietzschean superman, the autocratic dictatorship of Nazism, Fascism, and many modified forms in other lands of these promised ways of redemption. In all of these schemes of life God is ignored; or he is subsidized in the hope that, whatever he may be and be able to do, he will be on the side of those who patronize him.

With all the changes that have come about in the time of the modern age, many of them of inestimable value for the culture, comfort, and welfare of men, one thing has remained the same and that is *human nature*. Men, women, and children the world over have the same needs, the same joys, the same sorrows, the same hopes, the same helplessness, the same fears; they are born, live, die. If you prick them will they not bleed? If you tickle them will they not laugh? If you poison them will they not die? Men are beginning to see that man alone is not sufficient to become and to remain truly human; that he cannot solve his problems by human ways, that he needs resources that even humanity as a whole cannot supply. Consequently as the Reformers went back to the apostles, men are now turning back to the Reformers; and we are told that in Europe at least there is a "rebirth of the spirit of the Reformation."

Another thing does not change—*God and the gospel of God in and through Christ*. He is the same yesterday, today, and forever. But the Church, which is the bearer of the gospel, has changed and has failed to be true to its message since the Reformation. The experience of nineteen centuries proves that it is not easy to keep gospel as good news that begets faith and hope and love in the hearts of men. On the one hand it crystallizes into dogmas, institutions and laws which are presumed to have divine authority and by the aid of which men are to save themselves. In other words, Christianity is petrified. On the other hand, the gospel is resolved into human ideas and programs, brought to the level of man's understanding and within the reach of man's will; a philosophy of the universe and a moral way of living is all that was left of the evangel of Jesus and Paul. In other words, the gospel is naturalized and secularized ending in the bankruptcy of liberalism. Man, without God, is regarded as sufficient unto himself, aided by

science and the highest values of the race, to attain his destiny. One may trace the catholicizing and humanizing process in each age of the Church—the Ancient, the Medieval, the Modern. Each age reached a crisis and with it an attempt to restore the original Gospel, glad tidings, to men. Therefore we have had epoch-making men such as Paul, Athanasius, Augustine, Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Spener, Wesley, and Barth.

To describe in the concisest form the crisis in which we now are and the necessity of re-discovering the evangel of God and reforming the Church in the light of the evangel, I shall quote at some length a paragraph from *Religion and Revolution* by Professor Adolf Keller:

> "The war meant not only the defeat of an army. It was the defeat of a spirit; it dramatized the limit of man's possibilities. The suffering which is everywhere today to be found in the majority of the Continental countries has had its own deepening influence on the human mind. Great ideals collapsed during the war. Never before have the helplessness of mankind and the futility of human effort become so visible as in the last fifteen years. It is not only the defeated countries which have come to the end of their wealth and means; to all nations the war has meant deprivation, poverty, and helplessness. The war did not settle one single human problem. It did not destroy war. It did not make the world safe for democracy. It did not bring peace. It did not create new possibilities for international fellowship and cooperation. Even the peaceful methods of the League of Nations and the International Labor Office, the Economic Conferences, and the Disarmament Conference, have not been successful in realizing their great ideals. It is as if the spirit and mind of men had lost all power to move and change the world. Neither the military efforts of the armed nations nor scientific research, nor conference methods have found a way out of the difficulties of the world. No new ideal of the society of man, no social effort, no human sacrifice, no moral idealism has been able to deliver mankind from the scourge of unemployment, the economic world crisis, the spirit of hatred, and the exclusive nationalism which still menaces mankind with disintegration and disaster."

Whither shall we turn but to the living God—the God of Creation, Providence, Redemption—whose will of justice and love is to be done as in heaven so on earth; God revealed by the prophets, incarnate in the Christ, dwelling through his Spirit in the church; the God of grace who forgives, the God of love who provides, the God of truth who guides. As we live in the faith and labor in the

love and hope of his gospel, men's hearts will change; and only through changed hearts will the kingdoms of the world become the Kingdom of the Lord and his Christ.

The name of the Evangelical and Reformed Church bears with it a great responsibility—that we be true to the heritage of our fathers, not their dogmas, their institutions, their customs and laws, but to their faith and hope and love which sustained them in good and evil times in the Old World and the New for four centuries. Perpetual repentance and the renewal of faith by daily fellowship with God, and the assumption of the life of love in Christ in all the relations of life is the call that comes to the members of the Evangelical and Reformed Church.

Lancaster, Pa.

FROM LIBERALISM TO REALISM IN MODERN RELIGION

Robert C. Stanger

There can be no doubt that something has happened to liberalism in our day. A reaction has set in to this school of thought everywhere. It is quite common to read in modern journals of religion about "the sickness of liberal religion," and the "dilemma of liberalism." Men of prominence and religious leaders who once held this position themselves are now most vehement in criticism of it. This is true not only in the field of religion. The liberal position is considered below par in the political and economic field as well. A recent article by Nathaniel Peffer in Harper's Magazine entitled "The Breakdown of Liberalism" does not refer at all to religion, but to the social and political sphere. The argument is that all of the plans of social liberals have ended in futility because they were not coming to grips with the realities of the situation and did not recognize the ruthless nature of the forces at work in modern civilization. A recent book inveighs against the "illusions and deceptions of a liberal culture," and goes on to say that this "age of liberalism, rationalism and optimism is ushered to its close by a World War." Men like Barth and Brunner in theology delight in puncturing the pretensions of liberalism. All of this strikes one with particular force because only a decade ago liberalism was in its heyday. Theological seminaries boasted of their liberal spirit, and the younger ministers prided themselves on their liberal point of view. Progressive Church papers were "liberal journals of religion." So the term "liberal" became a badge of honor, and not to be so labeled was a certain sign of obscurantism and lack of progressiveness. What has happened to bring liberalism into ill-repute today?

I

We live in a day of crisis. We are told on every hand that we have come to the end of an era, and the fact can scarcely be doubted by anyone who can "discern the signs of the times." With the passing of an era the dominant thought-forms and the ruling attitudes which shaped that era are also doomed to pass. Certainly the prevailing spirit of the past decades has been that of liberalism. The pendulum, of course, always swings to extremes, in theology as in every other field, and the severe reaction to liberalism as well as the emphatic turn in the direction of realism in our day must be understood with that in mind. It is the purpose of this study to evaluate this movement from liberalism to realism in religious thought.

In the first place it is rather important to become clear as to the terms involved. Just what do we mean by "liberalism" in religion? It may be well to distinguish between liberalism as a spirit and as a system of thought. As pointed out in a recent editorial in the "Christian Century," re-published in this "Magazine" in the last issue (p. 235), liberalism arose as the expression of a revolt against authoritarianism. It distinguishes itself by the method of *free inquiry*. How much we owe to this spirit of freedom in religion we Protestants need hardly remind ourselves. Certainly, in some sense, we want to preserve the liberal spirit. The development of our whole modern culture, the growth and development of the scientific spirit, the coming of the method of research and experiment, were all of them conditioned upon this spirit of free inquiry. So our modern world came to be, with its science, its inventions, its discoveries; with its extension of the universe in time and space, its ideas of evolution and progress, its increasing control over nature, and the mounting achievements of its machines. Religion found itself in a new world, as different from the static world of the forefathers as anything could be. No wonder that increasing numbers of people found it difficult, if not impossible, to hold to a religion expressed in the thought-forms of an old world in the midst of this amazing new world. Was religion an anachronism? Was it true after all that it had no validity in this new world. The liberal point of view arose as an answer to this question. It desired to restate the Christian gospel in terms acceptable to the modern mind. The men of liberal spirit endeavored to "adjust" our Christian beliefs to the new world-view of science, and to orient religion in the new cultural environment. It was possible to be thoroughly modern and yet thoroughly religious and Christian! Without this service of liberalism untold thousands of thoughtful people would have lost all contact with religion. The liberal movement sought to show that it was not a matter of "either—or" but of "both—and." For this we cannot be too grateful. Let us say then that by religious liberalism we mean on the one hand the spirit of free inquiry, unfettered by the restraining hand of dogma or ecclesiasticism, and on the other hand that system of thought which accepts modern culture and seeks to adapt Christianity to it. It endeavors to make Christianity "intellectually respectable," and at home in the modern world.

Before pointing out the failings and shortcomings of liberalism we ought to record our gratitude for the service it has rendered to the cause of religion. Strangely enough the chief critics of liberalism today are those who have been for a time its chief advocates. (Let it be said at the very outset that in criticizing liberalism we are holding no brief for conservatism, at least not in the sense in

which that word is popularly understood, i.e. hard and fast orthodoxy or what was once known as "fundamentalism". In our opinion it fails entirely in its approach to the modern situation.) Liberalism has made some permanent contributions to the cause of the Christian religion. Let us try to enumerate them. In the first place, it has established the *right of free inquiry* and the *place of the intellect* in religion. We are to love God not only with "all our heart" but also with "all our mind," and that means with a mind untrammelled. While we are aware of some of the limitations of the use of reason in religion, and while we know that it is not the final and decisive arbiter, yet we can never again deny its rightful place. Real religion has nothing to fear from honest thought, and we can and must subject our religious experience to the scrutiny of reason as much as any other aspect of our experience. The liberal spirit has stimulated scholarship of the highest order. The application of the scientific method to the study of religion has set it free from the superstitions and the crudities which have often been associated with it, and has also freshly affirmed the reality of the religious experience. It may be remarked that intellectually religion stands higher today than it ever has. A second permanent contribution of liberalism is the *historical approach to the Bible,* which has given a new meaning and value to the Scriptures. We have come to look upon the Bible not as an infallible text-book, but as embodying the developing religious experience of a great people. We view the books of the Bible in the light of their origin. We examine the historical circumstances out of which the books came and inquire as to problems which they set themselves to solve. So the Bible becomes once more a living book. Recognizing that the writers always clothed their message in the ideas and thought-forms of their own day it is possible to distinguish between the permanent religious message and the contemporary form of expression. So both the literary and the religious values of the Bible have been re-established, and the liberal approach has given the Bible renewed meaning and validity in the eyes of the modern man.

Another great achievement of liberalism is the *recovery of the historical Jesus.* This is one of the finest achievements of modern scholarship. While Christ has been and still is the object of the Christian faith, yet we never dare forget that this faith is built upon the achievements of an historical figure. To recover more clearly the outlines of this figure is a distinct service to religion. Our faith must have a firm basis in history if it is not to evaporate in myth and legend. Today we know the life of Jesus better than ever before through the researches of historical scholarship. We understand the political background of Roman sovereignty against which the mighty drama of the gospels must be viewed. We know

the social situation which produced him; we recognize the religious parties and movements which opposed him. Against this background the ethical implications of the teaching of Jesus have become plain. The significance of the cross becomes more impressive when we view it in its historical setting. Liberal scholarship has restored for us the outlines of the historical Jesus.

II

Yet, with all of these positive contributions, many feel that liberalism has strong and pronounced *weaknesses,* which are becoming ever more apparent. For one thing liberalism has tended to be *negative* in its emphasis. Since it was forced to assert its position and maintain it over against a hide-bound dogmatism, it became necessary to emphasize points of disagreement. It is always easier to point out the things which we do not believe than to positively assert those which we do believe. No movement can thrive on denials; power lies in great affirmations. Undoubtedly liberalism was at times bound up with a spirit of superiority and sophistication, which delighted in pointing out the inconsistencies and inadequacies of traditional viewpoints, rather than moving forward to great constructive statements and attitudes. In these critical days when men are desperately crying for a positive and saving word of religion there is little appeal in mere negations. Lack of a positive emphasis is one of the great weaknesses of liberalism. In the second place liberalism placed *excessive emphasis upon the role of reason* in religion. It became too rationalistic, and believed that final condemnation had been passed upon any belief when it could be labelled "unreasonable." It believed that intelligence is mankind's supreme need. It forgot that "the heart has its reasons which the head does not know," as Pascal said. There is a coldness about rationalism which freezes the fine flower of religious enthusiasm, and which is not conducive to an ardent religious experience. People are no longer as confident as once they were that intelligence alone can lead us to the promised land. With the general deflation of the confidence in the powers of human reason came a change of attitude towards liberalism.

A more serious charge against the liberal position is that in order to adapt religion to the new world view of science it resorted to the *policy of compromise,* giving up territory here and there in order to keep the peace. Many feel that we paid too great a price for the harmonization of religion and modern culture. Liberals were satisfied with a "minimum interpretation" of religion, maintaining the bare essentials of religion, but giving up as much beyond that as the accommodation to science seemed to demand. Every new pronouncement of science would be met by a new "ad-

justment" on the part of religion, and by a new strategic retreat. There was little realization of the fact that religion does not exist by permission of the scientists, but that it stands forth in its own right. Vital religion says: "Thus saith the Lord," and looks neither to the right nor to the left. The great convictions of religion do not have to wait for the scientists and sociologists to pass upon their validity. Scientific pronouncements often give splendid support to these convictions. But in the last analysis it does not make a great deal of difference to God whether Prof. Eddington believes in him or not. Religion grips the lives of people not because it has the endorsement of universities but because it has been verified in personal experience. Liberal religion has been too cautious and apologetic, and too often devoid of conviction. Finally, it must be noted, that in aligning itself completely with modern culture, dominated by the scientific point-of-view, liberal religion accepted the sentimental optimism and the *romanticism* which characterized that culture. Faith in human progress, "onward and upward forever," fostered by the theory of evolution, and in the gradual perfectibility of man and his world were quite characteristic of liberalism. In those great days of the war, and in that flare-up of optimism after the war and before the "great disillusionment" it was quite generally believed in liberal circles that "the kingdom of God is around the corner," and that only a little more education and the spreading of good-will would forever banish war and poverty. They seemingly did not suspect the ruthlessness of the forces at work in human life and in society at large, and the terrible power of evil and sin which had poisoned the blood-stream of mankind. They did not seem to recognize the realities of the situation. In the words of Prof. Horton of Oberlin: "Liberalism accepted all the ideas of the era, and with the decline of this era its disintegration begins." On the basis of the points enumerated—the negative emphasis, the rationalism of the movement, the tendency to compromise, and the romanticism and superficial optimism which characterised it—we can draw up a fair indictment of liberalism.

The whole drift of religious thought in these days is in the direction of *realism*. Even a superficial observer of modern thought currents will realize that "realism" is the guide-word of this new era. To call anything "unrealistic" or "romantic" is to pronounce judgment of a final or absolute character upon its value. The term has various shadings and meanings, and just what is implied is not always clear. In the realm of national and world issues we come face to face with the political realists ("Real-Politik"). Fascism claims to be absolutely realistic in its approach to national and international problems. In the field of literature, noticeably in the realm of fiction, realism is the prevailing vogue, often car-

ried to nauseating extremes. The younger theologians and the keen-minded religious leaders are talking about a "realistic theology" and are pleading for greater realism in religious thinking. All of this merely indicates the temper of the modern mind, and is well for us to recognize it and to try to understand it. It is a temper of mind which craves objectivity and revolts against subjectivity. It is opposed to all romanticism and sentimental optimism. For the sake of clearness we offer this definition of realism by Prof. Horton of Oberlin: it is "a resolute determination to face all the facts of life candidly, and then, through the hard facts to pierce to objective reality, and see what ground and foundation is there." It desires above all also to see things as they are, rather than as we would like them to be. That there are dangers in realism, which we must guard against, will be evident. Yet this viewpoint is needed today, if our preaching is to have any power and our religion any vitality.

To many of us this new point-of-view in religion comes like a refreshing breeze on a sultry day, and brings new vitality into the languishing religious life of our time. It puts iron into our blood and a new courage into our heart. We find that as we follow the lines of religious realism, we *recover certain emphases* in our preaching, which are in line with essential Christianity as it has come down to us in the Christian tradition. In that sense only can followers of this trend of thought be said to be returning to "conservative viewpoints" in theology. We are re-discovering through the realistic approach some of the *abiding verities* of the Christian message, which were obscured by liberalism. By becoming more objective in our religious thinking we have come closer to the heart of reality.

III

What are some of the emphases which we are re-discovering? In the first place we can find a new meaning in the belief in the *will of God* and the *Providence of God.* With the breakdown of the myth of a messianic science and with the weakening of the case for materialism the evidence for spiritual reality and cosmic purpose becomes compelling. Certainly an observer of the history of recent years and of current events finds new justification for the faith that injustice and vindictiveness, crookedness and lies cannot last permanently in a world in which justice and honesty are a part of the fundamental structure of things. There is a force at work in the world which makes for righteousness and a process moving steadily in the direction of justice. The "long look" at history confirms this. Evil destroys itself; lies do not last forever; men sow the wind and reap the whirlwind. Listen to the testimony of a

sober historian, James Anthony Froude: "One lesson and only one, history may be said to repeat with distinctness: that the world is built somehow on moral foundations: that in the long run it is well with the good: in the long run it is ill with the wicked." The prophet Amos in one of his visions saw the Lord beside a wall with a plumb-line in his hand, symbolizing the fact that the universe is squarely built and that there is a moral and spiritual order which persists and which unfailingly works itself out in human affairs. So a frank facing of the facts of life and racial experience confirms our faith in the will of God at work in the world. And more than that, the experience of those who adjust themselves to the law of God and who try to cooperate with its purposes convinces them of a grace which makes "all things work together for good to them that believe."

Another great emphasis in our Christian message which the realistic approach recovers for us is that of the *reality and power of sin* in human life. "Sin" may well be called one of the lost words in the modern vocabulary. It was considered to be rather unpopular and unfashionable to speak about human sinfulness. A good deal of preaching and of popular thought emphasized the essential goodness of human nature. Sin, at the worst was imperfection or social maladjustment. It was hoped that with the development of education and the increase of intelligence the imperfection of human nature would be eliminated, and greater and greater progress would be achieved. All of this was a reflection of the optimism and sentimentalism of the liberal point of view. It was characteristic of a time of prosperity. The great defect in this whole point-of-view was the fact that it did not see deep enough nor grapple realistically enough with the stubborn facts of human nature. With the coming of the catastrophe of the world war and the days of depression, leading up to the present crisis, men were brought face to face with reality once more. Oddly enough, at the very time when liberal thinkers were bowing sin politely out of the door, the psychologists were bringing it in at the window. No dyed-in-the-wool Calvinist could paint a darker picture of human nature and the insidious character of the forces at work there than did the Freudian school in psychology. Strange passions, dark "libidos" were operative in the life of man, working ruin and destruction. There was a time when great hopes were held out for education as the savior of the race from that imperfection which still clung to it. "Modern civilization," said H. G. Wells, "is a race between education and catastrophe." It was education that would bring in the millennium. Is there any evidence today that the marvelous expansion of education has saved us from the threat of catastrophe? Today we know what is wrong with our society; we

have all the information we need about our order of life. The thing we ought to do is plain. The hindrance is not in outward circumstances but in the stubborn and perverse will. And sin is nothing more or less than a perversity of the will. In the words of Prof. Horton once more: "When the road to Utopia is so plain to the mind the human race cannot find the way. It cannot will its own good. We do need understanding. But the more we analyze the more we see the stubborn factors which do not yield to understanding (i.e. sin)." Of course, it is silly and insane to have poverty in the midst of plenty, and starvation in the midst of bulging storehouses. We know what is needed to bring the abundant life to all. There are no end of blue-prints for Utopia. But the forces of human selfishness and greed are so firmly entrenched, are so deeply rooted, even in the best of us that we cannot do the thing which is best for us. How everlastingly true is the insight of the Apostle Paul: "The good that I would that do I not, but the evil that I would not, that I do. O wretched man, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" We are sinners: that is not old-fashioned phraseology, but a growing conviction borne in upon us by a realistic facing of the facts of life.

It follows that since man seems unable to will his own good and to work out his own salvation that some help must be available for him in the universe, if he is to be saved. Here we come upon the heart of the Christian message. No matter what our likes or dislikes may be, the fact is that historical Christianity is a religion of salvation. Jesus is not merely a great historical character and a wonderful teacher of ethics, pointing out the way of life truly and supremely. All of that is true, but it does not account for the power of Christianity in history. Jesus is the one through whom and in whom something was done for man and in man. God was working through him. He has released a life and a power through which sin can be overcome and selfishness can be vanquished. Nor is this merely a gospel of "personal salvation." The salvation which Christ brings is a social salvation as well. The spirit which Christ generates in men is that of love, which is a social virtue. It reaches out to others, and needs a social expression if it is to be true to its nature. The genius of the Christian movement is fellowship. In those periods of history when it was most vital it always resulted in the establishment of a fellowship. By its very nature it makes for a communal order of life. Let it never be forgotten that Jesus envisaged man's ultimate salvation in terms of a "kingdom of God." It is the "Beloved Community," to use Prof. Royce's well-known phrase, which God is evermore seeking to establish. No person who faces the world of our day realistically can doubt that it needs nothing so much as the spirit of fellowship and of love. It is a tragedy

that both of these words have been so sentimentalized, as to lose much of their powerful meaning. Let us substitute for them the words "cooperativeness" and "powerful good-will," and we have the statement of Christian salvation in realistic terms.

We have tried to explore certain areas of Christian conviction which open up to us under the stimulation of the approach of Christian realism. Other lines of thought will at once suggest themselves as we follow this approach. Let us maintain all that is of value in the liberal point-of-view, especially the liberal spirit. But let us be led by the facts of our situation today into a more realistic position. Our endeavor has been to point out the fact that in order to be vital Christianity in these days will have to be more realistic than it has been. A larger measure of religious realism will give us deeper convictions and will put new life and power into Christian preaching and living.

A DECISION CONFRONTS THE CHURCH

Paul L. Lehmann

The Christian Church at this moment stands embarrassed before the world. How far this state of mind is a critical one for Protestantism only, is a question sufficiently serious and difficult to require separate discussion from the standpoint of the theological, not the historical issue that prompted the reformation of Catholicism. In no sense, however, can this be relevant to the predicament in which the Churches of the Reformation now find themselves. Otherwise it would mean either that Protestantism was hiding behind the robes of its "mother superior," or had actually abandoned its own existence and returned to the fold of *una sancta ecclesia catholica*. The embarrassment, of course, remains. Its roots are so deep-seated that those who deny it only attest its reality. For they show thereby that they know neither what the Church is, nor what the world is like in which all of us are living. The facts are unchanged, and their deadly consequence with them. The continued frustration of the Church in the modern world perpetuated her impotence.

In Germany, for example, in the decades after the war, it had become a commonplace that the Church had lost her hold on large sections of the toiling population. When these, in turn, unhinged the long hallowed traditions of an hierarchical society, the Church could find no voice for the day that had dawned because the hollow echo of her previous address to Emperor and General, Junker and Industrialist, left the words broken in the throat. She told herself the Republic was no occasion for an ex-cathedra utterance. And now German Protestantism is torn asunder because it opened its mouth too hastily. As if the responsibility for silence in the face of one national crisis could be absolved by over-much speaking in the face of another, the Church moved with disconcerting alacrity to point out the divine mission of the government of national socialism. Her minister did not even shrink from proclaiming to the still quite imperial town of Bonn on Easter Sunday, 1033, that the resurrection of Jesus was but the prototype of the imminent resurrection of the German people. One may wonder a little about the inner spirit of a Church for whom socialism had to become "national" in order to gain recognition. But when almost every new governmental decree has the effect of nullifying its propaganda of a classless society by widening the breach between those who labor and those who employ, as well as by decorating the latter with the ancient and pre-revolutionary prestige of those who, though but satellites, dominate the rulers of the State, one wonders less, and be-

comes contritely suspicious. Can the Church that hailed the inaugural of the "third empire" do otherwise than hail its labor law and its sensational jurisprudence of last July, though the former virtually enslave those who toil and the latter repose in the head of the State everything in dignity and power that a monarch could desire except the title and the crown? One wonders less than one suspects that the silence and the speaking of the Church have been dictated not by any concern for the meaning of her existence in the world but rather by the eagerness to be in harmony with as well as in subjection to the "higher powers." Indeed, it is significant and pathetic that the present vigorous protest of the Protestant ministry in his unhappy land against the pretentious claims of the State is motivated not by any serious opposition to the central spirit of national socialism, its economic and cultural nationalism, but only by the desire to keep the Church ostensibly free from absorption by the State. It does not seem to be clear to the Church that serious concern for her freedom must involve opposition to Nazism, just as it was not clear that the Republic was an occasion for ecclesiastical aggressiveness as surely as was the "third empire." But is it clear? Can the Church really speak without wavering to the time in which the Church exists? Who is there bold enough to charge her with infidelity to her high trust as the "Bride of Christ" when she is again drawing great numbers to her altars?

Dotted over the expanses between New York and San Francisco recently were memorial services in honor of the late German President. Now of all the functions of the Church perhaps none is more appropriate and more above question than the one of bringing consolation in the hour of death. But it is just possible that what will linger most in the memories of men from the reports of those services will be neither the prayers nor the discourses on the meaning of death on which depends the solace which the Church can bring. Will it not rather be the monotonous eulogies in which ministerial egos were expanded out of all proportion and the somewhat ghastly reproductions in sabre, uniform, and flag of what every Church from Strassburg to Breslau and from Munich to Hamburg must have looked like within on this occasion? If the Church is really zealous for her ministry to the dead, one can at least wonder how it happens that her altar fires are not perpetually lighted and her doors perpetually open and her heart as heavy for him whose passing is marked only by an entry in the files of the Bureau of Vital Statistics as for him whose name is emblazoned in headlines in the press around the world. But when these same churches are known in the several communities in which they lift their spires to the skies as "German" rather than as "Christian" Churches, one wonders less and becomes contritely suspicious. Can

the Church that hails as the bond of unity by which her walls are knit together some other spirit than the "one Spirit," do otherwise than hail as sweet-smelling and pleasing unto the Most High the odor of whatever incense the children of men are enthusiastic to burn in His temple? One wonders less than one suspects that the speaking and the silence of the Church are dictated not by any concern for the meaning of her existence in the world but rather by the eagerness to be in harmony with as well as in subjection to the "higher powers."

It seems that by the grace of God alone American Protestantism had been spared the convulsions that followed for the German Church upon the blessing which they gave in common to the outbreak of bestiality, the twentieth anniversary of which we are now enduring. What has been happening during this "grace period" is that the same disease has been as surely but not as dramatically ravaging the soul of the Church in this hemisphere. The "Hindenburg Memorials" are so self-evident that they seem like signs of health not symptoms of sickness. Did not the people turn to the Church and were her seats not crowded? Where is the minister who on such an occasion was not proud that he had been able during this time to build a Church large enough to hold the throngs? The embarrassment of the American Church is only less acute than that of her neighbor across the sea because the logic of world events has left the illusion easier to follow that similar decision can be delayed or perhaps even avoided. The one is the Church of victory and credit, the other the Church of defeat and debit. It is difficult to recall, isn't it, any significant or concentrated protest on the part of the Church of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln against either federal re-armament or the federal collection of "blood money"? And the reason, in part at least, seems to be that, on the one hand, American Protestantism has adopted for itself the prevailing pattern of American life, and on the other, to have allowed the difficulty of saying the right word at the right time to prompt the conclusion that the word which the Church has spoken has been the right word.

It is not wholly an exaggeration to suggest that General Motors and the A and P, have set the pace for the Church in the United States in the decades since the war. That is, the Church has likened itself to the dominant instrument of American life during these years, namely, the corporation. We have all seen agricultural and industrial maps of our country. On them are dotted the produce and the manufacture of the United States according to the location of origin. What would a relief map look like on which every new Church, not to mention those enlarged or remodeled, were indicated? It is safe to hazard the guess that the number of marks

of location would be considerable, and heaviest, of course, in those areas where population and financial power were concentrated. It is no accident that Pumpkin Center has no Riverside Church, and this, not only because the "number of souls" that could be effectively reached in the neighborhood is less but also because it is unsafe to allow investments to wander too far from their source. A Church, in spite of its large-scale ambitions is at best a "poor risk." But money was easy then and Churches expanded. The occupant of the pulpit, who was also the director of the budget, suddenly had a message which if it was worth hearing at all was worth hearing by the whole city and its visitors. Broadcasting would probably have been cheaper. But then the personal equation is less and the ego can hardly enlarge itself so well in the pageantry of ritual when there are only ears to hear and no eyes to see. Moreover, the devout were glad to express their piety in bonded investments which supplied an extra incentive for regular Sabbath appearance in the pew. The corporation idea seemed capable, at last, of making Church membership profitable.

Then there was the inspiring conception of a "larger program for larger service." What the community did not provide or could not provide in the way of recreation, medical clinics, social and intellectual stimulation must be supplied by the Church. It was never a very serious problem that these secular interests could always be cared for more effectively by secular agencies. The Church must not be behind but in the vanguard of the prevailing persuasions of the populace if religion is not to be eclipsed altogether. The result is that the measure of a Church is taken by the variety and extent of its program and the bulletin board of any "up-to-date" parish hall is more akin to the panels which line the walls of an automobile sales-room or a brokerage than the gate-way to the house of Jehovah whose sole identification is the "Holy of Holies." Where there is no Chevrolet, there must soon be one. It is quite irrelevant whether there ought to be one there or not. Just so, there is no segment of human activity with which the Church is not vitally concerned. It is equally irrelevant whether it ought to be so or not. For the Church is not interested in doctrine but in life. There is no interest of humanity that is so secular but that it can be a little hallowed, and then gradually more so, by the patient but persistent effort of the Church. Indeed, it is almost as if the so-called "higher standard of living" which is the fruit of the corporate production and corporate finance in these United States were precisely what the Church has all along been standing for in her vision of the more abundant life. Not that the Church has grown materialistic—emphatically not! But if the Church can sufficiently infuse the spirit which has fashioned these "goods" of the world with

her own spirit, with the enthusiasm for "good"-ness, truth, and beauty, then there will have come to fulfillment that harmony between the Church and the world for which the Church has been eager from the first. The witness of the past gives ground for hope. For is it not so, that of all the centuries of this companionship between world and Church, the last is the best, since in it there has been a greater correspondence than ever before between the comforts that men have and the impulse to use them in the interest of their fellows? The latter, of course, still lags, as always, behind the former. But the meaning of this is that the Church and the world must work together in patience awhile longer.

The delay, however, will be more protracted than expected. For our corporate life has suddenly been severely crippled. It is very unlikely that bonds of the Church will yield any earnings when General Motors is "way down". Hardly more likely is it that the bondholders in the congregation will be able to make the same pledges to the general budget of the Church until the investments begin to bring returns again. Consequently, those in whose general interest the larger program of service was inaugurated, can by the same logic be expected to grow indifferent or hostile to the cause of religion as the Church has presented it. The Church? One wonders at least whether the Church is really there where the gilded cross upon the spire is superseded by a mortgage and where the vested leader of the service is not even the director any more, but merely the collector of the budget. It is so obviously an occasion for contrite suspicion that the Church has been talking too much when she should have been silent with repentance.

Meanwhile other forces have been at work in the world which have not lightened the burden of the Church. Here is a given labor dispute in which both workers and employers count their names on the ecclesiastical roster. The tactics of both groups for the sake of an industrial advantage are not at all above reproach, The facts of the case are difficult enough at best to get. What shall the Church do in the matter? Can the Church do anything? It is just as necessary to ask, "Can the Church do nothing?" If the Church takes either side, does she thereby identify herself with the brutalities which are inevitable in the struggle of the one against the other? And what if in the end it appear that the Church acted on inadequate data, that in this particular dispute the employers really had the better case, or vice versa? Or again, when during the past summer, the newspapers were telling us that the San Francisco strike was an outrage because it was purely the work of Communists and because it was a violation of the general comfort of the public, to which beyond dispute it is entitled, was this an occasion for the silence or the speaking of the Church? Must those

who want to act as Christians in such a case rely only on the press for their judgments or can the Christian judgment look elsewhere for its source and its incentive?

When the Church does become vocal in the modern world it is never so that the listeners around the world could gather that the Lord of Hosts had roared from Zion. The sounds are discordant and disparate. A resolution passed by one ocnference is as readily cancelled by the absence of one in another, and those that do gain acceptance soon become as dusty in the memories of those who supported them as on the minute books. For the most part there is no voice at all. One wonders how there could be one, when the Church has become so intimately a part of the prevailing social pattern that she rises and falls in an astonishing parallelism with the stock market, and her only independent message is—listen to it still from any Christian pulpit on any Sunday morning—that she believes that Christianity is slowly but increasingly gripping the minds and the motives of men. How can the Church do otherwise than imagine that her resolutions are more than silence when on the one hand, her Gospel has become largely a benediction upon human achievements, and on the other, it is so terrifically difficult to speak? When then, the Church either does not speak at all or imagines that her silence is the right word for the hour, one wonders less and becomes contritely suspicious. Perhaps, the Church should have been speaking loud and long and her silence is the silence of the dead.

This has been an extensive excursion into the embarrassment of the Church before the modern world. There is no claim that a complete account had been given either of the predicament of the Church or of what may be said in extenuation of it. It is simply the conviction of this essay, that a realistic appraisal of the situation in which the Church now finds herself will at least include the sketch that has just been reviewed. Clearly the American Church is no more on trial than the German Church, and the both of them, than Protestantism wherever it is found at the present moment. But the Church is on trial! And just as clearly the picture that has been painted is no chimera but is *the situation* in which the Church now is. How is the Church to meet it? Three brief suggestions may be made in answer.

The Church must understand herself. If she had not lost this understanding she could not be embarrassed. She is embarrassed because she has taken her existence for granted and when the existence is threatened she must defend it. *That the Church exists*—this is her final tower of strength. Her gospel of progress and her program of service, what do they mean if not that the Church is no more and no less than any other social institution and just as

indispensable as the best of them? Where else would the ideals of the race come from and values be fostered? That both were a part of the race long before the Church appeared is usually minimized in the eagerness to demonstrate that without the Church they would have perished. The Church must attract men's attention, she must enlist their interest and support because her purposes are ultimately one with theirs and with proper advertising and proper pedagogy they will listen. Correct! The basic appeal of the Church on terms like these is always the appeal of the Gospel that is possible, the "Christianity that works." Jesus is the "Man Nobody Knows," the Bible is the "Book Nobody Knows," and Albert Schweitzer must endure every sort of homiletic abuse in order that the difficulties of the Christian life may not be totally discouraging. But surely the Church of Jesus Christ has other foundation than this amiable accommodation to the categories and the desires of men! Surely she owes her existence to Him whose name she bears or she is not His Church! It is not that the Church is ignorant of her origin, nor that she intentionally forgets it. But rather that she takes the implications of her origin less rigorously than she ought. The Christian Church lives no less by the authority of Jesus in the days nineteen centuries removed from Him, than in the days when first He bequeathed to her His Spirit. It is neither an accident for man nor a human necessity that the Church should exist. Her existence has meaning always and only as her Lord endows her with His Spirit and she is faithful to His will. Otherwise the Church is not the Church of Christ.

The Church must face the fact of conflict with the world. A Church that is concerned about her own existence rather than about the Lord whom she serves will always take her harmony with the world more seriously than the world will take its harmony with the Church. The world is often glad for the cooperation of the Church, more often still will make a direct bid for it. But ultimately the world will have its way. The coronation of the Reichsbishop will probably proceed in Germany though half the parishes rise up in opposition. The armies of the world will have their chaplains to hallow the murders which their very existence makes inevitable no matter how much the Federal Council of Churches resolve itself for peace. It is not without significance that the chaplain on duty wears the uniform of his commission not the frock of his ordination. The fundamental question between the Christian Church and the world is one of sovereignty. The Church that is so at home in the world that she takes her existence for granted, will always be embarrassed by the world for the allegiances to which the men of the world necessarily give themselves will not only make demands on the Church greater than she can possibly fulfill, but will ulti-

mately demand a choice between these loyalties and that one out of which the Church is born.

The Church must ever and again decide to serve the Lord and Giver of her life in the midst of certain conflict. Where there is no decision there is no conflict, and where there is no conflict there is no Church. This is the point at which the reality of the Church's embarrassment before the world is so tragic. For there is something permanent about this aspect of her situation. Instead of facing her situation in the world as the consequence of her devotion to her Lord, the Church has made a "problem" of it. She has been zealous for truth and for the right, and above all, that whatever action she takes shall be "fair" to all parties to the conflict. But because the truth and the right are always prejudiced by the network of vested interests in which the Church along with all the other institutions of men is caught, they never appear, if at all, until after the critical moment of decision is passed. Moreover, if the Church does not decide, the logic of events will! Indecision is equivalent to death for the Church; for it means that the Church has abandoned the meaning of her own existence *in* the world, and decided *for* the world. The Church, however does not live by the world but by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. She runs the risk of disobedience whatever step she take. The Lord is slow to anger and plenteous in mercy. But if the Church does not speak at all, it could be that this is to commit that sin for which there is no forgiveness. "When they deliver you up, be not anxious how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you." (Matthew 10: 19-20) The embarrassment of the Church before the world is, perhaps, at bottom, the inner embarrassment which comes of having decided not to utter that which the Father *has given* her to speak.

Luther als religiöser Erzieher.

Professor D. Dr. Hermann Werdermann, Dortmund.

Die Lutherforschung hat in der letzten Generation einen starken Antrieb erhalten. Zunächst durch die Weimarer Ausgabe (W. A.), von der bis jetzt über 65 Bände in Quartfolio vorliegen. Viele Schriften sind dadurch erstmalig zugänglich geworden und andre in einem wissenschaftlich einwandfreien Text. Hinzu kam, daß eine ganze Anzahl wertvoller Funde gemacht wurde, die in das Werden und Denken des Reformators neue Einblicke eröffneten. In Zwickau und Chemnitz wurden die Bücher der alten Erfurter Klosterbibliothek wieder entdeckt, auch das Buch mit den Eintragungen über Entleihungen. So wissen wir genau, welche theologischen Werke der junge Priester Martinus Luther in den Jahren 1507—1508 in Erfurt durchgearbeitet hat. Ja, wir können noch feststellen, in welcher Geisteshaltung er sie gelesen hat. Denn damals waren alle Bücher auf Schreibpapier gedruckt, und man nahm es dem Entleiher und Leser nicht übel, wenn er am Rand seine Zeichen und Bemerkungen machte. So können wir noch heute ablesen, was Luther mit seiner zierlichen, kleinen, klaren Handschrift am Rand vermerkt hat, Fragen, Zustimmungen, Striche, Randglossen. Und wir sehen, wie kritisch er bereits damals Werke des Augustin und des Petrus Lombardus durchgearbeitet hat.

Noch wichtiger ist es, daß wir den Professor Luther in seinen Vorlesungen in seiner vorreformatorischen Periode in Wittenberg belauschen können. Wir wußten, daß er damals ausführliche Vorlesungen über den Römerbrief, den Hebräerbrief gehalten hatte. Aber der Inhalt dieser Vorlesungen war uns nicht mehr bekannt. Da wurde in Rom, in der vatikanischen Bibliothek eine Nachschrift der Römerbriefvorlesung gefunden, sie war wohl aus der Heidelberger Bibliothek dorthin gekommen. Und bald darauf wurde die eigentliche Römerbrief-Handschrift in der Berliner Staatsbibliothek entdeckt, wo sie, bisher unbeachtet, gelegen hatte. Ebenso sind uns Nachschriften von Studenten über Luthers Hebräerbrief zugänglich geworden. Wir können dadurch feststellen, wie weit der junge Professor Luther in den Jahren 1515, 1516 bereits vorgedrungen war in reformatorischer Heilserkenntnis.

Auch in Bezug auf den Prediger Luther wurden wichtige Neufunde gemacht. Wir hatten Luthers Predigtpostille und die Hauspostille. Aber sie waren keine eigentlichen gehaltenen Predigten, sondern „Materialsammlungen" für die protestantischen Prediger. Die Predigten selbst, die Luther in großer Zahl in Wittenberg gehalten hat, waren uns in ihrer ursprünglichen Fassung nicht erhalten. Diese herzustellen war erst möglich, als in Jena in der Uni-

versitätsbibliothek neue Nachschriften von den Predigten entdeckt wurden, die Luther in den Jahren 1528 bis 1532 in Vertretung von Bugenhagen in der Wittenberger Stadtkirche hielt. Durch Vergleichung von mehreren Nachschriften derselben Predigten ist es möglich geworden, den wirklichen, gewaltigen Lutherischen Gemeindepredigten in ihrer ursprünglichen Fassung sehr nahe zu kommen.

Erwähnt sei auch noch, daß neue Forschungen es uns ermöglichen, das Bild Luthers ganz anders zu sehen als frühere Geschlechter. Das Durchschnittsbild, das sich von Luther verbreitet hat, ist geschichtlich falsch. Er war keineswegs der „Mann in der behäbigen Fülle des Körpers, mit breitem Gesicht, starken Kinnbacken, sanft blickenden Augen und etwas schwammigen Zügen." Auf den vier echten Cranach-Bildern sind Luthers Züge viel schärfer und markiger; der Mund ist geschlossen; zwischen den Augen liegt eine regelrechte Zornesfalte. Er nahm meist eine „reckenhafte Haltung" ein, wie ein Zeitgenosse uns beschrieben hat, „also, daß er sich mehr hinter sich als für sich neigt." Und dunkle, fast dämonische Augen funkelten aus seinem Gesicht, die fast alle, die ihn sahen, beschrieben als Löwenaugen, Falkenaugen.

So ist unsre Kenntnis von Luther in Bezug auf das Innerliche und das Aeußerliche wesentlich bereichert worden. Und die Allgemeinheit schenkte der Lutherforschung und ihren Ergebnissen in erhöhtem Maße ihr Interesse. Zwar schien es 1917 zunächst so, als ob das Jubiläumsjahr der Reformation, die Vierhundertjahrfeier des Anschlages der 95 Thesen, im Lärm des Krieges und nachher der Revolution unterginge. Aber nachher wurde offenbar, daß im Gegenteil gerade die schweren Erschütterungen durch die Kriegs- und Nachkriegserlebnisse den Boden gelockert hatten, den Reformator ganz anders zu sehen und zu verstehen als früher. Eine innere Aufnahmefähigkeit war durch die persönlichen und völkischen Erschütterungen geschaffen. So fanden die Bücher von Heinrich Böhmer, Luther im Licht der neueren Forschung (5. Auflage 1918); Böhmer, Der junge Luther (Flamberg-Verlag 1925) und K. Holls „Lutheraufsätze" (5. Auflage 1929) starke Verbreitung und innerlichste Beachtung. Nach allen Seiten hin wurde der Reformator neu beleuchtet: Der Prediger, der Deutsche, der Theologe, der Professor, der Schriftübersetzer und Bibelausleger. Eigenartigerweise ist aber **eine** Seite an Luther sehr stiefmütterlich behandelt worden, und das ist seine religionspädagogische Bedeutung, über die unser Aufsatz darum gerade handeln soll.

Nicht ganz einfach steht es mit den Quellen für Luther als Pädagoge. Nur wenige seiner Schriften behandeln direkt Erziehungsfragen, so die Schrift „An die Ratsherren aller Städte deutschen Landes, daß sie christliche Schulen aufrichten und halten sollen" (1524), oder der Sermon „Daß man die Kinder zur Schule

halten solle" (1530), ferner der Kleine und der Große Katechismus. Aber Einzelgedanken finden sich in fast allen Lutherischen Schriften, besonders auch in den Predigten und in den Tischreden. Im Grund ist Luther durch und durch „Erzieher." Die religiöse Erziehung der Jugend und des ganzen Volkes lag ihm schon sehr früh am Herzen. Und je mehr Luther den Eindruck erhielt, „daß die Alten schon zum Teufel wollen fahren," desto mehr rät er: „Man ziehe die Leute auf, die **nach** uns kommen!" In dem Grundansatz der Reformation waren zugleich pädagogische Notwendigkeiten gegeben. Wenn Luther z. B. seinem Volk die „Biblia deutsch" übersetzte und in die Hand gab, so mußte wenigstens die Lesekunst bei allen vorausgesetzt, beziehungsweise geübt werden, damit nun auch „Hans und Grete" darin lesen könnten. Ferner lag es Luther, im Gegensatz zu katholischem Kirchenglauben, sehr am Herzen, daß möglichst jeder evangelische Christ sprechen könnte: „Ich weiß, an wen ich glaube." Er mußte das Wesentliche des evangelischen Glaubens kennen, erkennen, ausdrücken und nötigenfalls verteidigen können.

Nun hat Luther allerdings in keiner Weise ein „pädagogisches System" aufgestellt und hinterlassen. Das Beste an ihm ist systematisch nicht zu erfassen. Wir sind auf viele Einzelschriften und Einzelstellen und Einzeläußerungen angewiesen, die sich oft schwer, oft gar nicht zusammenfügen lassen. Besonders in der Auseinandersetzung mit Gegnern scheute Luther scharfe, ja überspitzte Formulierungen seiner Ansichten nicht, die aber nicht verabsolutiert werden dürfen. Luther ist weitgehend in dem, was er sagt und wie er es sagt, wenn er auch aus ewigen Urgründen schöpft, der Mann des Augenblicks. Unsre Aufgabe ist es, die tiefgehenden Erkenntnisse, die Luther gehabt und geäußert hat, aus seinen Worten herauszufinden und zusammenzustellen. Nirgends haben Luthers Anschauungen etwas Starres, sondern stets etwas Dynamisches, eine trotz aller Spannung vorhandene und immer wieder zu suchende Ausgeglichenheit.

Die Träger der religiösen Erziehung sollten nach Luthers Meinung in erster Linie die Eltern sein. Sie stehen für ihre Kinder da „an Gottes Statt." Sie sollen ihre Kinder „nicht nur nach fleischlicher weyss lieb haben, sondern sollen sie zu Gottis Dienst mit worten und wercken in den ersten dreyen gebotten weyssen." (W. A. VI, 251). „O welch eine selige Ehe und Haus wäre das, wo solche Eltern innen wären, fürwahr, es wäre eine rechte Kirche, ein ausgewählt Kloster, ja ein Paradies." Vor allem die Hausväter werden ermahnt, ihre Familie, die Kinder, die Dienstboten „über tisch" in den christlichen Hauptstücken zu unterweisen. Darum schrieb Luther seinen Kleinen Katechismus ursprünglich auch für das Haus. Im Hause sollen die Kinder beten lernen, den Morgen-

segen, den Abendsegen, das Tischgebet. Besonders wirkungsvoll ist dabei Luthers eigenes Vorbild in der eigenen Familie gewesen. Denn was Luther von den andern deutsch-christlichen Familien forderte, verwirklichte er zuerst an seiner Tafelrunde im Schwarzen Kloster in Wittenberg. Er war selbst vorbildlich seinem ganzen Hause das, was ein christlicher Hausvater sein soll.

Neben dem Hause hat die Kirche eine religiös-erzieherische Aufgabe. Ihr liegt neben und zugleich mit der Evangeliumsverkündigung auch die religiöse und sittliche Erziehung ob. Darum hatten Luthers Predigten weitgehend eine pädagogische Abzweckung. Ferner muß man bedenken, daß damals bei den ungebrochenen kirchlichen Sitten wirklich die ganze Gemeinde in den Vor- und Nachmittagsgottesdiensten erreicht wurde. Luther wußte allerdings, daß „Gottes Geist wehet, wo er will"; aber er wollte Gott helfen, die Türen zu öffnen und offen zu halten. Er forderte, daß der Prediger ganz schlicht und volkstümlich sprechen sollte; er kann im Grunde nicht einfach genug sprechen, besonders wenn die Kinder im Gottesdienst sind. Es ist schwer, im Glauben und Leben ein rechter Christ zu werden; darum sagt Luther: „Ich muß menschlich davon reden, weil ihr noch schwache Christen seid." Mit Ernst, aber noch mehr mit Liebe wollte er jung und alt auf dem Weg zur Seligkeit weiterführen: „Ich treibe dich nicht; Christus lockt dich freundlich."

An dritter Stelle ist auch die Schule zu nennen, die nach Luthers Auffassung nicht nur eine allgemeine Erziehung geben, sondern auch die wahren Christenmenschen erziehen soll. Denn viele Eltern sind nicht imstande, selbst die Erziehung auszuüben. Die Predigten gehen zu oft über die Köpfe gerade der Kinder hinweg. Da soll die Gemeinde, der Staat durch christliche Schulen helfen (W. A. XV, 27 f.). Die Schulen sollen „die heylige schrifft üben als ihr eygen buch"; sonst erzieht sie „eyttel holtzböcke!" Die Erziehung soll auch vom Staat in christlichem Sinn getrieben werden, „syntemal eyn recht Christen-Mensch besser ist und mehr nutz vermag, denn alle Menschen auf Erden."

Von größter Bedeutung war, daß Luther der religiösen Unterweisung drei Textbücher geschaffen hat. Das gilt zunächst von seiner deutschen Bibelübersetzung. Gerade im Herbst des Jahres 1534 wurde sie beendet, hat sich also jetzt vierhundert Jahre im evangelischen Religionsunterricht ausgewirkt. Luthers deutsche Bibel ist Jahrhunderte lang sogar das Unterrichtsbuch, das Lesebuch, das Lernbuch geworden. Luther war der Meinung: „Viele Bücher machen nicht gelehrt, viel Lesen auch nicht, sondern gut Ding und oft lesen"; „Vor allen Dingen sollte in hohen und niederen Schulen die furnemste und gemeinigste Lektion sein die heilige Schrift." Und so schwer verständlich vieles in der Bibel ist, aufs

Ganze gesehen war Luther doch der festen Ueberzeugung, daß Gottes Wort „nicht dunkel, sondern hell" ist, daß auch schon die Jugend einen unmittelbaren Zugang habe zu dem Evangelium. Dabei ist die Bibel nicht nur „Lehrstoff," sondern „Viva vox," im Grunde nicht etwas, woran **wir** arbeiten, sondern wodurch Gott und der Heilige Geist an unsern Herzen arbeiten. „Es sind nicht Lesewerte, sondern eitel Lebeworte drinnen, die nicht zum Spekulieren und hoch zu dichten, sondern zum Leben und Tun dargeboten sind."

Neben der Bibel schuf Luther den Kleinen Katechismus, die „kurze Summa," was ein evangelischer Christ von Glauben und Leben wissen muß. In kindlicher und volkstümlicher Weise ist hier in Frage und Antwort das Wichtigste dargeboten: Wie ein Christ leben, wie ein Christ glauben, wie ein Christ beten soll. Der Kleine Katechismus hatte damals einen ungeheuren Erfolg. Ganze Generationen des Protestantismus sind an ihm gebildet worden. Eine erstarrte spätere Katechismustradition ist dann oft Bahnen gegangen, die Luther nicht gewollt hat. Für Luther war der Kleine Katechismus Glaubenszeugnis; später hat man oft ein „dogmatisches Kompendium" daraus gemacht und ihn in unkindlicher Weise traktiert. Luther hatte den Katechismus sofort in seiner ersten Ausgabe mit Bildern ausgestattet: er wollte Anschaulichkeit, nicht Abstraktion. Das Katechismusjubiläum im Jahre 1929 hat vielerlei gelehrte Schriften und praktische Anweisungen hervorgebracht, die zeigen, daß auch heute wieder versucht wird, das Wertvolle und Lebendige aus Luthers Kleinem Katechismus der Gegenwart und Zukunft zu erhalten.

Das dritte Buch evangelischen Religionsunterrichts ist seit Luther das Gesangbuch. Luther schuf das evangelische Kirchenlied und gab das erste evangelische Gesangbuch heraus. Er war überzeugt: „Die Musika ist eine schöne, herrliche Gabe Gottes und nahe der Theologie; die Jugend soll man zu dieser Kunst gewöhnen; denn sie macht feine, geschickte Leute." Luthers Lieder hatten solche Kraft, daß man mit Recht sagen kann, er habe das neue Verständnis des Evangeliums dem Volk noch viel mehr ins Herz hinein gesungen, als von der Kanzel hinein gepredigt.

In zunehmendem Maße hat meist auch die Kirchengeschichte einen Bestandteil evangelischer religiöser Erziehung gebildet, ganz in Luthers Sinn. Denn die „Historia" hat er selbst geliebt und für die Schule geschätzt. Man soll die biblische Geschichte und die Kirchengeschichte kennen lernen, daß man daraus „witzig und klug" werde. Man soll sich die Erfahrungen früherer Geschlechter zu nutze machen; denn „zu eigener Erfahrung gehört viel zeyt." So schuf Luther schon 1529 ein Passional mit vielen Bildern. Und er ist überzeugt, daß „die Kinder und Einfältigen" „durch Bildnis

und Gleichnis besser bewegt werden, denn durch bloße Wort und Lehre."

Ein rechter Erzieher muß wissen, wie es um das Kind bestellt ist. Wie ist es damit bei Luther? An diesem Punkt könnte man zunächst feststellen, wie stark man empfindet, daß zwischen seiner und unsrer Zeit mehr als vier Jahrhunderte liegen. Vor allem muß bedacht werden, daß die Pädagogik und die Kinderpsychologie allgemein von Rousseau bestimmt ist, der von der Güte des Menschengeschlechts ausgeht. Dem gegenüber ist Luther überzeugt und spricht es häufig aus, daß wir alle, auch schon die Kinder, hineingehören in eine Sünd- und Schuldverflochtenheit. „Die Schuld ist, daß unsre Natur durch die Erbsünde ganz und gar verderbt und verrückt ist." Er stand zu dem Bibelwort, daß „das Dichten und Trachten des menschlichen Herzens böse ist von Jugend auf." Und in seiner Schrift „De servo arbitrio" geht er, in Auseinandersetzung mit Erasmus, diesen Gedankengängen bis in die letzten Tiefen nach. Aber daneben hat Luther ja auch die Schrift geschrieben „Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen." Und so hat er, im Blick auf die Kinder, auch die Unschuld der Kinder beobachtet und betont. Vor allem in den „Tischreden" finden wir viele Zeugnisse dafür. „Wenn du willt ein imaginem eines Engels sehen, so sieh an ein fein fromm hertzlein wie ein klein kindt, das niemand schaden getan hat und das auch nicht gedenkt, schaden zu tun." „Ah, die Kinder sein die Allergelehrtesten: die vertrauen irem vatter und sagen auch von Gott fein einfeltiglich, daß er ir vatter sei." „Der Kinder Gebet ist gut, denn sie haben noch eine reine Stimme." „Lieber, sehet an die jungen Kinder, welcher Leiber noch reiner und sauberer sind, als die noch etlicher Maß etwas, wiewohl gar wenig, von Adams erster Art haben." „Lieber Herr Gott, wie gefällt dir doch solcher Kinder Leben und Spiel. Ja, alle ihre Sünden sind nichts denn Vergebung der Sünden." Nach Luthers Meinung soll also der religiöse Erzieher beides wissen und berücksichtigen: das Böse und das Gute im Kind. Luther selbst war gleich weit entfernt von liberalisierender Verharmlosung wie dogmatisierender Erstarrung.

Die Methodik ist innerhalb der Pädagogik der am meisten zeitgebundene Teil. Das empfinden wir auch, wenn wir die Methodik Luthers betrachten. In seiner Grundeinstellung ist da Luther ein Kind seiner Zeit. Bei seinem Kleinen Katechismus z. B. war es ihm selbstverständlich, daß dieser wörtlich auswendig gelernt wurde. Dies geschah nach der Sitte seiner Zeit durch Vorsprechen des Lehrers, Nachsprechen der Kinder, Abfragen, Wiederholen, bis hin zum „Einpauken." Aber über dieses zeitgebundene Element in Luthers Erziehungsart hinaus finden wir auch eine Anzahl feiner, fruchtbarer Anregungen. Vor allem soll man bei

evangelischer Erziehung immer etwas von der „frohen Botschaft“ merken. Freude soll in den Religionsstunden walten. „Euangelium ist eittel freude.“ Darum hat „zorniges Wesen“ hier keinen Platz. „Ueberdruß und Unwillen“ dürfen bei den Kindern nicht entstehen.

Um die Kinder zu verstehen, soll der Lehrer auf ihr Eigenart eingehen. Das Vorbild dazu findet Luther bei Jesus selbst. „Christus, da er Menschen wollte ziehen, mußte er Mensch werden. Sollen wir Kinder ziehen, so müssen wir auch Kinder mit ihnen werden.“ Gewiß ist die Erziehungsarbeit bei vielen Kindern nicht leicht. In seiner derben Art erklärt Luther, daß es solche Kinder gäbe, die „eitel Holzböcke sind und bleiben.“ Bei den Widerspenstigen heißt es dann auch streng sein: „Dem Wolf kannst du nicht zu hart sein“; aber „den schwachen Schafen kannst du nicht zu weich sein.“ Die Lehrer, die „über die Köpfe der Kinder hoch herfliegen,“ bezeichnet der Reformator als „giftiges Geschmeiß und Dünkelmeister.“ Sie müssen gewarnt werden, die Kinder zu überfordern und zu „überladen.“

Eine Hauptforderung Luthers ist: Anschaulichkeit. Und Luthers Werke sind ja noch heute eins der eindrücklichsten Beispiele, wie man anschaulich und plastisch reden und erzählen kann. Luther erlebt die heilige Geschichte selbst als gegenwärtig mit: „Tam recens mihi nunc Christus est, ac si hac hora fudisset sanguinem“ (W. A. 43, 463). Diese Gegenwärtigkeit und „Gleichzeitigkeit“ sollen wir auch unsern Kindern vermitteln. Dazu helfen uns „Chroniken und Historien“ anschaulich zu sein. Ueberall braucht er Sinnbilder, Gleichnisse, Personifikationen. Auch hier merken wir seine drastische Derbheit, wenn er redet von „Junker Fleisch, der den Holzweg gehen will,“ von Meister Klügling, Hans Saurüssel, Bauchknecht und andre.

Zu dieser Veranschaulichung können wir auch die häufige Verwendung von behaltsamen Sprichwörtern rechnen. Mehrmals wird von Luther das Wort verwendet: „Wo unser Herrgott eine Kirche baut, da baut der Teufel eine Kapelle hinnach“; oder „Gott bleibt nicht außen, ob er gleich verzieht.“ „Seid gern allein, so bleibt euer Herz rein.“ „Ein gut Lied kann man nicht zu viel singen.“ Er bemüht sich auf solche Weise, eine Brücke zu schlagen von der Unterrichtsstunde zum alltäglichen Leben. Denn aller Unterricht weist nach Luther über sich selbst hinaus ins Leben hinein. „Wir müssen den Glauben üben in allerlei Fällen.“ Dabei bleibt er sich bescheiden dessen bewußt, daß es auch bei der religiösen Erziehung nicht „an unserm Rennen und Laufen“ liegt, sondern an Gottes Gnade. „Hier soll man fleißig unterscheiden das Werk des Heiligen Geistes.“ Der Religionslehrer ist wie der Prediger nur

„das Werkzeug; die Röhre." Darum ist zusammenfassend seine Mahnung: „Gott sorgt; wir aber sollen arbeiten."

Dabei wirkt nach Luthers Ueberzeugung am stärksten der Religionslehrer durch das, was er **ist**. Seine Worte sind vergeblich, wenn die Kinder ihm nicht anspüren, daß er mit seiner ganzen Persönlichkeit dahinter steht. Aber da man dies Luther selbst so stark anmerkte, darum hat er auf seine Zeit so gewirkt. Ja, die Glut war so stark, daß sie auch durch seine Schriften noch hindurchwirkt und uns heute noch das Herz warm macht. Joh. Ficker hat uns ein feinsinniges Bild von „Luther als Professor" entworfen (Halle 1928). Danach stand Luther vor seinen Zuhörern „frisch, sicher, immer fröhlichen Angesichts." Er empfahl als für sich bedeutsam das Gebetswort: „Mit einem freudigen Geist rüste mich aus" (Psalm 51, 14). Und die vor ihm sitzenden künftigen religiösen Erzieher warnte er: „Hütt euch, yhr jungen Gesellen, fur der Tristitia! Unser Herrgott hat's befohlen, daß man soll fröhlich sein." Die Herzen seiner Zuhörer gewann er dadurch, daß er nicht als ein Fertiger vor ihnen stand, sondern daß seine Tätigkeit ein gegenseitiges Nehmen und Geben war. Ferner warnt er den religiösen Erzieher vor „Eigendünkel." Auch bei unsrer religiösen Erziehung bleibt die Tatsache: „Mit unsrer Macht ist nicht getan." „Je länger wir waschen, desto unreiner werden wir." Aber gerade wer so demütig vor Gott steht, „aus dem kann Gott etwas machen." „Das Verzagen ist nützlich; die Gnade liegt nahe dahinter." Dem Demütigen läßt es der Herr gelingen.

Als Kraftquelle empfindet er immer wieder das Gebet. „Ich halte mein Gebet für stärker als den Teufel; wo das nicht wäre, sollte es längst anders mit dem Luther stehen." „Wenn ich das Gebet einen Tag lang lasse anstehen, so verliere ich ein großes Stück vom Feuer des Glaubens." Aber wer betet, der kann auch arbeiten und wirken, zur Ehre Gottes, zum Segen der Menschen. So steht der religiöse Erzieher Luther vor uns, als geschichtliche Gestalt und doch zugleich auch als ein Mahner und Anreger für die Gegenwart. Wer sich mit ihm beschäftigt, bei dem werden, direkt und indirekt, neue Kräfte wach für die eigne Erziehungsarbeit in der Gegenwart.

Der Bekenntnisparagraph der neuen Kirche.

Dr. G. Fr. Schuetze.

Nach dem Pamphlet „The Plan of Union" ist der Bekenntnisparagraph unsrer neuen Kirchenvereinigung sehr kurz. Er lautet:

"We acknowledge and accept the historical confessions of the two churches as the doctrinal basis of the union."

Ich muß gestehen, daß ich ihn bedeutend ausführlicher gewünscht hätte. So, wie er ist, gibt er nur die Basis, und zwar eine recht weite Basis, für einen zukünftigen Bau. Ich hätte es sehr gern gesehen, wenn man sich nicht damit zufrieden gegeben hätte, nur das Grundstück zu bezeichnen, auf dem der Bau errichtet werden soll, oder — geben wir zu — den Grundstein, oder schon einen Teil des Baues, sagen wir das Erdgeschoß, zu errichten. Möge dieser Aufsatz dazu dienen, wenigstens einen Baustein zu dem Gebäude darzureichen, welches die berufenen Männer errichten werden, und, setzen wir hinzu, hoffentlich in absehbarer Zeit.

Wenn die am 26. und 27. Juni vollzogene Vereinigung nicht nur eine äußerliche bleiben, sondern eine organische werden soll, so ist, meines Erachtens, vor allem notwendig, daß eine organische Lehrgrundlage geschaffen werde. Sonst kommt im besten Fall nur eine Arbeitsgemeinschaft dabei heraus, die in jedem Augenblick wieder getrennt und aufgehoben werden kann. Es kommt eben darauf an, ob wir nur eine Verwaltungsvereinigung wollen, wie in der Preußischen Landeskirche von 1817, die nur den äußeren Mechanismus vereinigt, ohne den Bekenntnis- und Lehrstandpunkt der einzelnen Gemeinde zu berühren, also eine mechanische Vereinigung, oder ob wir eine innerliche, organische Vereinigung, eine Verschmelzung im wahren Sinn des Wortes, der beiden Kirchen anstreben. Man sieht, daß ich das Wort „organische Vereinigung" nicht ganz in dem landläufigen Sinn gebrauche, in dem auch der Preußischen Landeskirche das Prädikat der organischen Vereinigung vindiziert wird. Wie die Gelehrten behaupten, kann nach dem Zusammenfluß zweier Ströme noch auf etliche Meilen hinaus das Wasser des einen Flusses von dem des andern unterschieden werden (z. B. bei Donau und Inn), aber endlich verschmelzen sie so völlig, daß man nicht mehr sagen kann, dieser Tropfen Wasser kommt aus dem einen oder dem anderen Fluß. Dasselbe verstehe ich dann auch unter der organischen Vereinigung der beiden Kirchenkörper. Daß man nicht sagen kann, dieser Mann kommt aus der Evangelischen Synode, und jener aus der Reformierten Kirche, sondern daß man nur sagen kann, er ist ein Glied der Evangelischen und Reformierten Kirche.

Und hier halte man mir, wenn ich bitten darf, einen kurzen

Exkurs auf die Namensfrage zu gut. Daß der Name „Evangelische und Reformierte Kirche" nur ein provisorischer sein kann und soll, darüber sind sich beide Seiten einig. Wenn aber in einem in der Juli-Nummer des „Theologischen Magazins" abgedruckten Aufsatz aus dem „Reformed Church Messenger" als der neue offizielle Titel vorgeschlagen wird „Evangelical-Reformed Church," so sehen wir darin ein so vollkommenes Aufgehen der Evangelischen Synode in die Reformierte Kirche, daß von unsrer alten synodalen Herrlichkeit nichts übrig bleibt als der magere Bindestrich (der im Lauf der Zeit auch noch verschwinden kann), dann müssen wir eine bessere Garantie für unsre Evangelische Eigenart verlangen. **Und zwar liegt diese in dem Bekenntnis.** In demselben Aufsatz gebraucht der Autor für die Reformierte Kirche auch den Namen „Evangelical Reformed Church." Wie gesagt, das ist doch ein sehr geringes Zugeständnis auf der Seite der Reformierten Kirche und macht eine anderweitige Sicherstellung unbedingt erforderlich. Ich bin der festen Ueberzeugung, daß viele Evangelische Brüder, wenn sie sich so sollen mit Haut und Haar von der Reformierten Kirche verschlucken lassen, lieber die alten Verbindungen lösen werden und sich an die U. L. C. anschließen, wohin sie nach ihrem Lehrstandpunkt mehr neigen. Nur eine formulierte Darlegung des Lehrstandpunktes der alten „Evangelischen Gewissensfreiheit" könnte diese Brüder bewegen, sich mit dem Namen „Evangelische-Reformierte Kirche" zufrieden zu geben.

Doch, um zum Thema zurückzukommen, zu einer solchen organischen Verschmelzung ist der neue Bekenntnisparagraph nicht völlig ausreichend. Sehen wir zu: Der Lehrstandpunkt der Evangelischen Synode war von je her ein „mild lutherischer." Das geht schon daraus hervor, daß unser Elmhurst College aus dem Melanchthon Seminar entstanden ist. Wir nehmen also nicht den Standpunkt eines Flacius oder Amsdorf ein, sondern vielmehr den Melanchthons. Folgerichtigerweise haben wir stets den **Konsensus** der beiden großen evangelischen Denominationen gefordert, verteidigt und behauptet. In dem neuen Bekenntnisparagraph ist aber der Konsensus ausdrücklich verschwiegen, wenn man so sagen darf. Auch ist das herrliche Prinzip der Evangelischen Gewissensfreiheit, „in allen Differenzpunkten sich allein durch die darauf bezüglichen Stellen der Heiligen Schrift leiten zu lassen" nicht erwähnt. Man mag mir vielleicht einwenden, der Konsensus und die Evangelische Gewissensfreiheit verständen sich von selbst und seien darum nicht erwähnt. Mag sein — ich will nicht darüber streiten — aber in **diesem** Punkt stehe ich doch auf dem Standpunkt Luthers in Marburg, der auf das **geschriebene** Wort „est" hinwies und auch sonst immer, z. B. in seinem Katechismus, „die Worte, so da stehen" betont. Sollte diese Frage jemals einem weltlichen Gerichtshof vorgelegt

werden, so können wir sicher sein, daß derselbe nicht nach stillschweigend angenommenen und als selbstverständlich geltenden Prinzipien urteilen würde, sondern nach den Worten, die schwarz auf weiß da stehen. Und deshalb hätte ich den Bekenntnisparagraphen ausführlicher und deutlicher gewünscht.

Wenn wir die historischen Bekenntnisse der **beiden** Kirchen als Lehrgrundlage anerkennen und annehmen, so hat das ja einen gewissen negativen, begrenzenden Wert, indem es alle antireformatorischen und ultraformatorischen Lehren ausschließt. Aber wir geraten aus der Scylla in die Charybdis, da sich viele der historischen Bekenntnisse kontradiktorisch gegenüber stehen. Es wäre doch eben so leicht — als die Berührungspunkte herausstellen — aus den beiderseitigen historischen Bekenntnissen, wie aus dem Heidelberger Katechismus, den Beschlüssen der Synode von Dortrecht, den Westminster Artikeln, Punkte herauszuholen, die in unvereinbarem Widerspruch stehen zu Artikeln der „Augustana Invariata" von 1530, den Schmalkaldener Artikeln und der „Formula Concordiae." Wir können aber unmöglich beides zugleich lehren, z. B. die Ubiquität des Leibes Christi im heiligen Abendmahl und die Calvinische Proposition, daß im heiligen Abendmahl die Seele von dem im Himmel bleibenden Christus gestärkt werde, oder gar den Zwinglischen Lehrtypus von einem bloßen Gedächtnismahl. Damit, daß wir nur die „historischen Bekenntnisse" neben einander stellen, ohne zu sagen, welches für uns gilt, oder den Konsensus und die Gewissensfreiheit zu betonen, führen wir die ungefestigten Brüder in schwere Konflikte und Versuchungen; die gefestigten aber stellen wir vor das Dilemma, entweder einen Lehrstandpunkt zu bekennen, den sie nicht teilen, oder aber aus der Kirche auszutreten. Wir wünschen doch sicherlich keine Opportunitätsbekenner, die um des bißchen, mageren Gehaltes willen sich auf Positionen verpflichten, von denen sie im Herzen überzeugt sind, daß sie unhaltbar sind. Weigern sie sich aber der Unterschrift, so tritt vor sie das praktische Dilemma, **wohin?** In vielen lutherischen Synoden werden sie mit so „liberalen Ansichten" keine Aufnahme und Unterkunft finden, und aus der Evangelischen und Reformierten Kirche weisen wir sie quasi hinaus; denn eine Verpflichtung auf **alle** historischen Bekenntnisse ist ohne — „sit venia verbo" — theologische Akrobatenkunststückchen **unmöglich.** Zudem wolle man bedenken, daß viele der Bekenntnisse eben weiter nichts sind als **historische** Dokumente, die aber heute keinerlei **praktische** Bedeutung mehr haben. Deshalb sollte der definitive, in die Konstitution der Kirche aufzunehmende Bekenntnisparagraph viel ausführlicher und ausdrücklicher sein, als der präliminäre, quasi tentative Paragraph des Plan of Union."

Weiter sollte es doch nicht so schwierig sein, aus den beiderseitigen Konfessionen die Punkte herauszuziehen und neu zu for-

mulieren, die keiner der beiden Seiten anstößig und unannehmbar sind. In der großen, überwältigenden Mehrzahl der Glaubensartikel sind wir doch „**ein** Herz und **eine** Seele." Die beiden Paragraphen, an denen man auf der einen oder anderen Seite Anstoß nehmen könnte, sind die „Praedestinatio gemina," die Vorausbestimmung der Bösen zur Verdammnis und die körperliche Ubiquität des Leibes Christi im heiligen Abendmahl.

Bringen wir einen gewiß unverdächtigen Kronzeugen, Professor Philipp Schaff. Er schreibt in seiner „Theological Propaedeutic":

"The Dogmatical Theology of the Evangelical Reformed Church agrees with the Evangelical Lutheran system, except in the doctrines of predestination, the sacraments, and the ubiquity of Christ's body" (p. 342).

Ein wenig später aber spreibt er:

"Moderate and progressive Calvinism omits or softens the five knotty points of Dort . . . It is in sympathy with the Melanchthonian type of Lutheranism" (ibid.).

So haben wir sicher nicht zu befürchten, daß wir uns durch die Verschmelzung zu einem Bekenntnis der Vorausbestimmung zur Verdammnis verpflichten müßten. Auf der andern Seite aber gibt es ebenso zwei Typen des Luthertums, den strikten Lutheranismus der „Formula Concordiae," der heutigentages noch von der Missouri-Synode gepflegt wird, und das gemäßigte Melanchthonische Luthertum, das in der Preußischen Landeskirche und der Evangelischen Synode von Nordamerika vorwaltet. So brauchen auch die Reformierten nicht zu befürchten, daß sie sich durch die Vereinigung mit der Evangelischen Synode zu dem Standpunkt Luthers in Marburg bekennen müßten, zumal da Luther selber der beste Zeuge wider sich selbst und seine Marburger Stellung ist. Man denke an die Wittenberger Konkordie vom 25. Mai 1536, nach deren Unterschrift Luther selbst mit 10 oberländischen Theologen gemeinsam das Mahl des Herrn genoß.

Einige Worte werden wir noch hinzufügen müssen wegen der von Schaff behaupteten Lehrverschiedenheit in den Sakramenten. Dieselbe läuft darauf hinaus, daß in der Lutherischen Lehre die Sakramente einen „kollativen," d. h. wirklich mitteilenden Charakter tragen, während die Reformierte Kirche den annunziativen Charakter hervorhebt. Daher könnte man sich sehr gut dahin einigen, daß man den **effektiven** Charakter der Sakramente betont und die Frage, ob kollativer oder annunziativer Modus, auf sich beruhen läßt. Allerdings würde dies wieder die deutliche Aussprechung des Evangelischen Freiheitsprinzips voraussetzen. Es sollte sich also nach dem Gesagten doch leicht eine Formulierung finden lassen, die

allen drei Lehrpunkten, Prädestination, Ubiquität und Sakramentslehre, eine solche Darlegung gibt, die nirgendwo anstößt, sondern auf dem anerkannten und ausgesprochenen Konsensus fußend, das Gemeinsame des Glaubens und Lebens zum Ausdruck bringt.

Mit Absicht und gutem Vorbedacht habe ich nach des Glaubens noch „des Lebens" hinzugefügt; denn die Evangelische Gewissensfreiheit, mit welcher wir nach dem Vorbild Augustins in unwesentlichen Dingen Gewissensfreiheit erlauben — nein, sogar fordern, muß sich doch auch in der Praxis des Lebens kund tun. Eine Gewissensfreiheit, die nur als dogmatischer Lehrsatz auf dem Papier steht und nicht in das sittliche Leben des Alltags übertragen werden kann und auch übertragen wird, ist doch **nichts**. Wie wir die Heilige Schrift als Kanon, d. h. als Regel und Richtschnur unsers Glaubens und „Lebens" anerkennen, so soll auch das Bekenntnis, das aus jenem Kanon ausgezogen ist, nicht für den Glauben allein, sondern auch für das Leben gelten. Es kommt hinzu, daß die ganze Entwicklung der zeitgenössischen Theologie, sei es bewußt oder unbewußt, auf die ethische Auswirkung der Dogmatik abzielt und hinausläuft. Man mag über diese Verquickung von Dogmatik und Ethik denken, wie man will — besonders die älteren Brüder werden ihre starken Bedenken tragen — das Bestehen dieser Tendenz ist nun einmal Tatsache. Sie äußert sich schon allein in den Schlagworten des Tages. Was bedeuten diese Worte, wie „Social Gospel" und „Social Ethics" anders als das Gebundensein der Kirche an die altruistische Auswirkung der Wortverkündigung? Und in gewissen Grenzen und Schranken ist das auch vollkommen berechtigt (man vergleiche dazu meine früheren Aufsätze im „Theologischen Magazin"). Der Glaube muß sich nun einmal im Leben auswirken; sonst ist er tot (Jak. 2, 17).

Anderseits aber tut es nicht gut, und würde ich stets meine warnende und abratende Stimme dagegen erheben, wenn man sich auf eine bestimmte theologische Position der Philosophie und spekulativen Weltanschauung festlegen wollte. Namen wie Spinoza und Karl Barth werden es sofort klar machen, in welcher Hinsicht ich diese Forderung aufstelle. Der erstere und noch manche andre Philosophen haben in der theologischen Denkart ihrer Zeit und auch der nachfolgenden Zeiten sich geltend gemacht. Spinozas Lehre von der göttlichen Immanenz übte seinerzeit einen starken Druck auf das theologische Denken aus. Hegel und Schelling sind andre Vertreter der Lehre von der göttlichen Immanenz. Aber Druck erzeugt beständig Gegendruck. So ist das Zünglein an der Wage jetzt in das entgegengesetzte Extrem hinübergeschlagen. Karl Barth ist zurzeit der stärkste Verteidiger der Lehre von der göttlichen Transzendenz. Aber wer weiß, wie bald wieder die andre Seite in den Vordergrund geschoben werden mag. Darum würde ich nie emp-

fehlen, daß sich das Bekenntnis auf speziell „theologische" Erkenntnisse und Positionen einlasse, überhaupt sich nicht auf praktisch indifferente Einzelheiten festlege, die in absehbarer Zeit durch eine andre Form der Erkenntnismethode wieder hinweg geschwemmt werden mögen. Wir sollten nur solche Sätze und Behauptungen in unser Bekenntnis aufnehmen, die der wechselnden theologischen Strömung Stand halten können. Das Bekenntnis ist, wenn auch **von Theologen**, so doch nicht **für Theologen** zu schreiben, sondern **für die** große, breite Masse der **Laienchristen**.

Wir fordern ein unzweideutiges, klares Bekenntnis für die neue Kirche, weil wir der Ansicht sind, daß ein solches allein der neuen Gründung Gehalt und Bestand zu verleihen mag, **weil das Bekenntnis allein der Vereinigung den Charakter der Kirche verleiht.** Eine humanitäre Vereinigung, wie das Logenwesen, wie die Rotarians usw. können wohl ohne eine Glaubensdarlegung auskommen (und doch haben auch diese Prinzipienerklärungen), **eine Kirche aber nie.** Die gemeinsame Arbeit, die gleiche Begeisterung für das Reich Gottes auf Erden, dieselben hohen Ziele und Ideale, gewiß, das alles ist recht schön und mag, solange das Feuer der ersten Liebe anhält, ein Glaubensbekenntnis als unnötig erscheinen lassen. Aber was **auf die Dauer** der Zeit die Beständigkeit einer Kirche gewährleistet, ist doch nur ein gemeinsames Bekenntnis. So lange wir nicht wissen, daß wir auf einem und demselben Glaubensgrund stehen, liegt die beständige Möglichkeit vor, daß sich die neue Kirche wieder in ihre beiden Komponenten auflöst. Wendet man aber mir ein, die Glaubenseinheit ist ja da, dann antworte ich mit der Gegenfrage: **Warum wollen wir dann diese vorhandene Glaubenseinheit nicht auch aussprechen?** Und dazu ist, ich wiederhole es noch einmal, der Bekenntnisparagraph des „Plan of Union" nicht ausreichend.

In welchen Linien würde sich dann nun das Bekenntnis der neuen Kirchenkörperschaft bewegen müssen? Ich würde unbedingt vom Apostolikum ausgehen. Das erscheint mir als durch die göttliche Trinität durchaus geboten. Die Form ist natürlich nebensächlich; aber der Inhalt muß durch die drei Artikel des Apostolikums gegeben werden. Eine Abweichung von diesem gegebenen Schema würde nur dann gerechtfertigt sein, wenn man die **Gottheit** einer der drei Personen Gottes entweder ausgesprochen **leugnet**, oder stillschweigend **ignoriert.** Unitarier, Universalisten und andre Sekten mögen sich das leisten: **Wir können es nicht.**

Vom Gedankengang des Apostolikums also ausgehend würde ich gleichfalls drei Artikel vorschlagen:

I. Der Vater und die Vaterschaft über alle Menschen.
II. Der Sohn und die Kindschaft aller Menschen.
III. Der Geist und die Bruderschaft aller Menschen.

Während die ersten beiden Artikel mehr dogmatisch, vielleicht rein dogmatisch gehalten werden müßten, komme im dritten Artikel die sittliche Verpflichtung und das sittliche Streben zum Ausdruck. Ich glaube ganz sicher, daß sich unter diesen drei Hauptkapiteln alles bequem unterbringen lassen kann, was überhaupt in ein christliches Glaubensbekenntnis hinein gehört. Ueber den ersten Artikel würde sicher kein großer Disput entstehen, ausgenommen vielleicht in dem Satz von der Prädestination. Diese aber brauchte kaum berührt zu werden. Der erste Artikel würde also die Lehre von der Schöpfung, Erhaltung und Regierung enthalten. Für den zweiten Artikel würde dann das gesamte Feld der Christologie vorliegen, also Christi Person und Werk. Er würde enthalten, wer Christus ist, was er tat und tut, und was er den Menschen zu tun befähigt (Glaube, Gebet und Sakramente). Damit wäre der dritte Artikel dann ganz für die ethischen Fragen frei gehalten sein. Darin müßte das geistliche Leben behandelt werden, wie es in die tägliche Erscheinung tritt (Geist, Kirche, Reichgottesarbeit, d. h. praktische Nächstenliebe). Das würde genug sein, wenn man sich auf einen Paragraphen beschränken will. Dieser Paragraph könnte dann ungefähr folgendermaßen aussehen:

„Unsre Kirche, als die Unionskirche der Reformation, nimmt als Lehrbasis den Konsensus der historischen Bekenntnisse der beiden großen evangelischen Kirchen an. In allen Differenzpunkten aber hält sie sich allein an die darauf bezüglichen Stellen der Heiligen Schrift und bedient sich der in der evangelischen Kirche obwaltenden Gewissensfreiheit. Unsre Kirche glaubt also an den dreieinigen Gott, der

I. Als Vater nach seinem vor Anbeginn der Welt gefaßten Heilsratschluß über die gesamte Schöpfung waltet;

II. Als Sohn, wahrer Gott und wahrer Mensch, durch sein Wirken, Leiden und Sterben auf dieser Erde und durch sein Walten im Himmel alle Menschen zu Kindern Gottes macht und ihnen den Zugang zum Vaterherzen durch den Glauben, das Gebet und die Sakramente offen hält;

III. Als Geist in seinem Reich auf Erden und in der christlichen Kirche regiert, alle Menschen zu Brüdern macht, ihnen die Pflicht auflegt und die Kraft verleiht, die Brüderschaft aller Menschen durch ein Leben im Streben nach Gott und in der Liebe gegen alle Nächsten zu verwirklichen."

Will mon aber ein ausführlicheres Dokument verfassen, wie es die Bekenntnisse der Reformatoren waren, so könnte das unter den folgenden Kapiteleinheiten geschehen: I. Gott. II. Schöpfung. III. Heilsratschluß und Prädestination. IV. Vorsehung. V. Gesetz. VI. Christus. VII. Erlösung. VIII. Aufnahme in die

Kindschaft. IX. Gebet. X. Sakramente. XI. Der Heilige Geist. XII. Die Kirche. XIII. Das Christusleben. XIV. Eschatologisches.

Ich würde aber ein solches ausführliches Bekenntnis nicht empfehlen; denn erstens ist unsre Zeit, wenn man so sagen darf, bekenntnismüde, und zum andern würde ich einer ferneren Entwicklung nicht vorgreifen wollen. Sollte sich in späteren Zeitläufen ein ausführlicheres Bekenntnis als notwendig oder doch als wünschenswert herausstellen, so kann es dann noch immer geschrieben werden. Für unsre Zeit und für unsre Vereinigung ist ein kürzeres, in einem Paragraphen zusammengefaßtes, Bekenntnis vollkommen ausreichend, aber auch dringend notwendig.

Gegenwärtig hören wir so oft: Bei euch Evangelischen kann ja jeder glauben und lehren, was er will; ihr habt ja gar kein Bekenntnis. Es scheint ganz unmöglich zu sein, unsre Gegner zu überzeugen, daß bei uns nicht jeder glauben kann, **was er will**, sondern nur, **was er vor Gott verantworten kann.** Und darum ist mein „Ceterum Censeo": **Laßt uns ein positives Bekenntnis schaffen.** Nicht wie unsern bisherigen Bekenntnisparagraphen, der in der Hauptsache negativ ist. Nicht wie den Bekenntnisparagraphen des „Plan of Union," der nur einen Schimmer von einem Bekenntnis hat. Sondern etwas **Positives.** Wir wollen und müssen etwas haben, das wir unsern Gegnern entgegenhalten können: Das **lehrt,** das **glaubt,** das **lebt** die Evangelische und Reformierte Kirche.

EDITORIALS

THE THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE'S FAREWELL

This number of the "Magazine" writes "finis" under its career. It is not pleasant to pronounce, as it were, the "ashes to ashes, dust to dust!" over a periodical that has had a long and honorable history. It is not pleasant for its friends, some of whom have been its readers for more than half a century. It is still more painful, of course, for its editor, who has cared for it since America entered the World War. For the last four years he had no other work, and now he will be compelled to give to private study the morning hours he used to devote to his Magazine work—and it is hard to make the former as satisfying and regular as the latter was. Besides, there is lacking the contact he used to have with his constituency.

It was not necessary to vote the "Magazine" out of existence. It is true that for a number of years it had been losing subscribers. It is also true that the urgent need for retrenchment seemed to threaten the publications that were losing us money. But there was one consideraion that changed the whole outlook and should have been heeded by the authorities. The Reformed Church was to unite with us. They had no theological periodical and were perfectly willing to get back of the "Magazine" with us. Dr. C. Heyl, the editor of the "Reformierte Kirchenzeitung," gave it as his opinion that we could count on three or four hundred subscribers from the Reformed, in the course of time. Dr. Geo. W. Richards, the president of the Reformed Seminary at Lancaster, Pa., gave even a much larger number as the probable increase from their side. With four hundred new subscribers from the Reformed and a somewhat growing support from us, there would have been no further deficit in the "Magazine" account.

But then, the General Conference in Cincinnati decided otherwise. A new paper is to be developed by Eden faculty and "others qualified," and this paper, it was hoped, would have a larger appeal. I wrote the president of Eden and presented the letters from leading Reformed men expressing a cordial willingness to offer Reformed support for our theological paper. In the final formulation the Eden faculty added the Reformed faculties (at Lancaster and the Mission House (Wis.) as sponsors for the new periodical. We hope, of course, that the new paper to be developed will fulfil all

the expectations placed thereon and that the present readers of the "Magazine" will transfer their allegiance to its successor.

Our readers will permit us a few general words on the past of the "Magazine". They remember that a year ago we observed its sixtieth anniversary. It had a number of short-term editors in the first ten years, until, in 1882, Professor W. Becker was elected to the position. He was succeeded in 1898 by Rev. Louis Haas, who retained the editorship until his death, in 1917. Since then the present—and last—editor has filled the place.

For many years the "Magazine" was largely a "theological" paper, in the strict sense of the word, i.e., it dealt pre-eminently with dogmatics. It found its material for discussion mainly in the three articles of the creed. Exegetic articles also were offered not infrequently. In the last twenty-five years the social gospel has taken an ever growing possession of the field in American Protestantism. We have tried to give the development of Christian social ethics which this gospel attempts, space and attention. The editor himself still feels the effects of his *theological* past, but he has sought the cooperation of social-gospel men. The late professor Vollmer rendered him valuable service in this respect and we felt the sense of a great loss when he passed away suddenly. But thre is now no lack anymore in our Church along this line. We imagine the new paper to be developed will lay a still more decided emphasis on social ethics. By the way, the editor was highly pleased when lately none other than the great Barth came out so strongly for theology and remarked that he had gotten over that "children's disease," the contempt for "theology". Perhaps we also learn from the same man to take a greater interest in exegesis. Up to now the Lutherans only continue to produce works on Exegesis, compare Lenski's great commentaries and the five-volume commentary on the entire Bible by a professor of Concordia Seminary.

The position of our "Magazine" has always been "mildly" orthodox. We say "mildly," because although strong on the points on which our faith rests, we believe in Bible criticism, in progressive revelation, in new viewpoints, and in the union of kindred denominations and the liberal interpretation of their confessions.

And now as we lay down the pen, we bid goodby to our readers and friends and thank especially those who have stood by us through thick and thin for so many years. May God's blessing be on the work we have tried to do; and may his blessing rest upon the new paper to come next year, its program, its contributors and its public.

TEMPORA MUTANTUR, NOS ET MUTAMUR IN ILLIS

This well known verse about the changes in views and attitudes that the changes of time produce, we want to apply to our relation to the *Bible*. The apostle says: "Grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: But the Word of the Lord endureth forever." It does, but our views about its temporal form undergo change. There are churches in our country which deny this fact. The Lutherans of the stricter type still believe in the literal inspiration of the Bible. Everything that is in the Old or New Testament is to be understood just as it reads. Jonah was actually in the belly of the whale three days and three nights, and the prophet spent that time in prayer and meditation. Joshua said in the sight of Israel, "Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon!" And the sun hasted not to go down about a whole day. To understand this as a literal, bare fact strains belief but the Lutherans take reason captive and let faith triumph. Such an attitude in the twentieth century is doubtless a handicap in a number of ways. Still, an uncompromising spirit has its great compensations and the Lutherans have grown and prospered beyond anything that either the Evangelicals or the Reformed can boast of.

Nevertheless, for us it is impossible to apply the methods of criticism to all other literature and traditions and refuse to do it in the case of the Bible. We hold steadfastly that the Bible is the book of books, the vehicle of divine revelation, but it has a human side, it reflects a long spiritual and moral development, and an unprejudiced mind cannot but admit it. In a process stretching through the centuries, the Church has gradually won its way to a sane but reverent view of the origin and the upward climb of the Bible. What the Church as a whole had to learn finds a repetition in the case of the individual. Let any one who has occupied himself seriously with the task of becoming a Bible student retrace his steps and he will see the resemblance.

In our childhood—perhaps much later—we read the story of the temptation (Gen. 3) and took it in a literal sense. It was a real serpent and a real apple tree. We wondered how a serpent could speak, but then we were used to animals speaking from the fables of the child world. The story of the Great Flood was a fascinating narrative. It must have been quite a job for Noah to get all the wild animals into the ark and keep them there without cages, besides, get food for all the different kinds. I can't remember that I personally, had any stirrings of doubt in my mind as to the truthfulness of the account. But later when we heard of the two men who tried to steady the ark and were struck dead on the spot for

it, I couldn't but think that there was something shocking to the sense of justice in it.

Naturally, it depends a great deal on a young person's environment whether the critical spirit manifests itself early. The writer was brought up in an atmosphere of devout piety at home and at school, and he does not remember that he had a single doubt as to the literal inspiration of the Bible until he went to the university. Later he came to this country and became a member of the Synod. It was ten years after Professor Otto had lost his position as professor at Eden because of his symbolical view of the temptation story. Our spiritual climate was that of orthodoxy, but there was no desire for more heresy trials. We have never really been in bondage to the letter. Since then a great change has taken place. No one bothers much about Bible criticism. The social gospel monopolizes the attention almost entirely. There may be still a few who go through their Bible without any criticism. If they are men of faith and character, don't think ill of them. If a man is chiefly a critic of the Bible without the power to witness to its creative function, he is a strange misfit in a Christian pulpit.

It is customary today to put the prophets in the place of highest honor in the Old Testament. Their message of social justice has captured the Christian world to a surprising extent. The miraculous element of the old dispensation is hardly ever mentioned. And yet some of us have had considerable trouble with it. Are those wonders in Moses' time and in the lives of Elijah and Elisha real happenings or only mythical accretions due to hero-worship? I take the position that back of the stories is a real divine element, the manifestation of a power more than human, but as to how far this fact saves the miraculous, I say: non liquet! The late Dr. Vollmer agreed with me in this respect. But he once said to me during our discussions: "You are so liberal as to the Old Testament, why are you so literal as to the New?" I said because Jesus is greater than Moses and Elijah. How far Dr. Vollmer made abatements as to the New Testament he did not specify in detail. A theological professor has to be guarded in his statements—and so has an editor or a minister. Why should we give occasion to the narrow to question our soundness? And on the other hand, why should we air our doubts in the pulpit?

Much more might be said on the question. We close, however, with the personal query: "Has the Bible made a better man and preacher of you after you had learned to read it critically, than you were when you took it with the mind of a child?"

ORATIO — MEDITATIO — TEMPTATIO

Before a large pastors' institute, held at Chicago Theological Seminary this summer, Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison preached a sermon on "the Crisis in Christianity." According to the reporter it was a great sermon, listened to by more than two thousand (most of them ministers), along the lines generally so ably advocated by the Editor of the "Christian Century". He demanded that Christianity conceive its task in terms of the *Kingdom of God* interpreted not as a private religious experience but as a *social goal.* At one time of the discourse the great audience broke out in applause which is not often done in such a place (the chapel of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago). It was when the speaker declared: "The social gospel means to the Church the Kingdom of God—not merely an inner kingdom but a social one. Let there be no doubt what this implies. The shift of the center of gravity from the inner life to the social order puts Christianity into an actual position of rivalry with the state for the rulership of this world."

A short time before this happened in Chicago, the Northern Baptist Convention met in Rochester. The main speaker was Hon. Charles Evans Hughes, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. He said, "I see no advantage to the Church in entering into the domain of these controversies (about social and economic problems). The Church has a far higher mission and cannot afford to impair its supremely important function of nourishing the spiritual forces of our people. No scheme of laws can take the place of self-discipline and the culture of the spirit of man."

The Presbyterian Banner of June 21, seemed to agree with Mr. Hughes. It said, "We are thankful that our great conventions stick to their own proper business and programs and keep out of the swamp and sea of settling the social order. Jesus in all his teaching said little on these matters, and we do well to follow him."

We see, then, men differ greatly as to the necessity and value of social gospel preaching. The liberals think it is the main business of the Church; the conservatives claim the most important task is the care and culture of the inner life.

This writer's position is that in this controversy we are not compelled to an "either—or" decision; it is rather a case of "both—and". The Church's first business is to convert the individual; the second, to help reorganize society. Jesus Christ, in the parable of the leaven seems to have clearly taught the necessity of Christianizing the social order. Nevertheless, if we are to appraise the two tasks as to their respective importance, we should say, by all means *take care of the inner life first.* The man must be a Christian first before he can do work that really counts. The individual's own

faith and rebirth furnishes the dynamic for all his actions and attitudes.

For this reason we have placed the church-father's three essentials for the Christian life at the head of this editorial. *Oratio,* i.e., prayer, is the primary requisite in any life that is to be moulded after Christ. The social gospel men seem mostly to make little mention of this. Of course, we know Rauschenbusch's "Prayers for the Social Awakening" and other material like it, but any one who knows how great a part prayer had in Jesus' life, in Paul's, in Luther's and all of the Christian leaders of the past, will notice the difference. With the ordinary social gospel preacher, it is action that counts, not devotion; it is "labora," not "ora." The writer doesn't know whether he is mistaken, but it is his feeling that the prayers generally heard in public are of little impressiveness; and if the ministers are lacking here, what can you expect of the laymen?

Meditatio is the second great requisite, meditation on the word of God. It is the same here as in the case of prayer. Our time has little aptitude for quiet meditation and reverent thought. The social gospel has indeed opened up to us viewpoints in the Bible and in the work of Christ that had long been hidden from view or ever been emphasized. We searched in the Old Testament for "words in heavy type," verses containing consolation and encouragement but not for the social teachings of the prophets, and in a similar way in the New Testament. But the Bible is not to us what it was to our fathers, to the Reformers or to the "Evangelicals". I have quoted before the opinion of one of our board members who when approached on this point expressed his opinion that not one in ten thousand ordinary church members read the Bible with any degree of regularity. We want to change our environment, the society in which we live, the external relations. We are not the Bible men our spiritual fathers were although the new translations of the Bible, above all Moffatt's, could make Bible study much more profitable.

Then there is *tentatio,* tribulation, experience, especially of the hard and trying kind. There is so much trouble in the world and in the church and in our own life. God's hand and word lead us into the "valley of Baca" (Ps. 84, 6) and out of it, so that we might advise others who are in it. Here is an important element of our Christian life and ministry. But there is not time to discuss it.

The reader will see that the editor leans heavily towards the individual gospel. Recently he preached a sermon on one of the promises of the Bible. He interpreted it largely in a personal and individual way. One of the men who had been in the audience took

him home. As soon as we were seated in the auto this man began to speak. The Church, he said, had now a supreme chance to aid the people in their problems; if she didn't take this chance and helped to change the present economic system, she would be doomed. He praised their present minister for his social gospel preaching.

I just listened, saying to myself, this layman puts the stress on the other side: we individual gospel men must be careful not to forget to move with the times.

„Vergesse ich dein, so werde meiner rechten vergessen."

So sprach der Psalmist im fernen Land, von Heimweh ergriffen nach dem Jerusalem seiner Väter. Aehnlich sind die Gefühle vieler Deutschamerikaner, wenn sie ihres Vaterlandes gedenken in seiner langjährigen Not. Es sei uns deshalb vergönnt, in diesem letzten deutschen Artikel des „Magazins" unsre Blicke nach Deutschland zu richten. „Unhappy Germany" war der Titel eines Editorials im „Christian Century," das sich mit der augenblicklichen Lage drüben beschäftigte. In der Tat, es sieht trübe dort aus. Seit dem Krieg und während desselben konnte man selten etwas lesen in hiesigen Blättern, das von Verständnis oder Teilnahme Zeugnis ablegte.

Seit aber Hitler der „Führer" deutscher Geschicke geworden ist, ist die Abneigung der öffentlichen Meinung hierselbst ins Riesengroße gewachsen. Der Antisemitismus des jetzigen Kurses und sein diktatorischer Charakter haben alles, was noch von Freundschaft übrig war, völlig erstickt. Es tut einem Deutschen in der Seele weh zu sehen, wie völlig isoliert das alte Vaterland unter den Völkern dasteht. Oft hat der Schreiber dieses es erwogen, ob eine Aeußerung seinerseits an Hitler nicht etwa einen gewissen Eindruck machen möchte. Aber es wäre doch vielleicht nur ein Schlag ins Wasser gewesen. Kürzlich sandte uns Paul Hutchinson, der Vorsitzende der „League for Equal Rights," eine Zuschrift, in welcher er uns aufforderte, der Boykottbewegung gegen Deutschland beizutreten. Er berief sich unter anderm auf einen Artikel von R. Niebuhr im „Christian Century": „Germany ought to be told." Man kann sich denken, wie mich diese Zumutung berührte. Ich schrieb an Hutchinson, ich hielte es für eine Unverschämtheit sondergleichen, von mir, einem Deutschen nach Geburt und Erziehung, etwas Derartiges zu erwarten. Das schloß natürlich nicht die Tatsache aus, daß meinerseits ich für Hitler nur eine sehr qualifizierte Begeisterung aufbringen kann. Doch politisch liegt es so, daß man nur zwischen Hitler und Chaos die Wahl hat.

Als Männer der Kirche sind wir an der kirchlichen Lage am meisten interessiert. Und diese Lage ist alles andre als zufriedenstellend. Müller ist immer noch der Reichsbischof und hat die Mehrzahl der Kirchenleute auf seiner Seite, oder unter seiner Knute. Dr. Jäger ist seine rechte Hand, der Mann, der Jesus zum Arier macht und dem Alten Testament gegenüber eine ablehnende Stellung einnimmt. Die neue Konstitution der Kirche wird sie dem staatlichen Einfluß restlos überantworten. Viele „Deutsche Christen" behaupten, der Pastor könne auch weiterhin das reine Evangelium verkünden, wenn er sich der Einmischung in das Kirchenregiment enthielte, und Verfassungsfragen nicht für Glaubensfragen ansähe. Diese Leute haben nie ein Verständnis für eine **freie** Kirche gehabt. Sie sind gewöhnt, von oben herab regiert zu werden. Die westlichen Provinzen dagegen haben seit langem die Presbyterialverfassung gehabt, kraft welcher sich die Kirche bis zu einem gewissen Teil selbst regiert, und in diesen Gegenden ist das kirchliche Leben von jeher kräftiger gewesen als im Osten. Wo die Kirche nichts zu sagen hat, ist auch Gleichgültigkeit die logische Folge.

Es war hier im Westen, wo sich kürzlich die Bekenntnissynode gebildet hat, welche die Alleinherrschaft der staatlichen Organe in der Kirche grundsätzlich ablehnt. Bayern, Baden und Hannover sind auch der Reichskirche nicht beigetreten. Gegen solche Renitenten droht der Staat mit Gewaltmitteln. Viele hunderte von Pastoren sollen suspendiert worden sein. Da eine öffentliche Diskussion dieser Dinge verboten ist, weiß die Oeffentlichkeit gar nicht, wie schlimm die Sachen eigentlich stehen.

Die Katholische Kirche wird sehr viel glimpflicher vom Staat behandelt, teils weil sie eine stärkere Macht ist, und teils mit Rücksicht auf das kommende Plebiszit im Saargebiet wo achtzig Prozent der Bevölkerung katholisch sind; auch weil man die Sympathien andrer katholischen Länder nicht verscherzen will.

Kürzlich hörte man von staatlicher Seite, die Opposition der Unzufriedenen beruhe nicht so sehr auf religiösen Gründen, sondern sie sei politischer Art. Man sei nicht zufrieden mit der Naziidee überhaupt. Das ist natürlich eine falsche Unterstellung. Die Widerstrebenden wollen nicht die Kirche zu einem willenlosen Instrument des Staates gemacht sehen. Gegen Hitler sind sie loyal eingestellt. Natürlich können sie an dem fast abgöttischen Kultus der Führerpersönlichkeit nicht teilnehmen. Gott und die Kirche stehen ihnen höher als Hitler und sein Reichsbischof. Wie die Zukunft sich in dieser Sache gestalten wird, ist schwer zu sagen. Daß jedoch schwere Kämpfe und harte Leiden der Kirchenleute und ihrer Gemeinden warten, ist nur zu wahrscheinlich. Die Gebete und die Unterstützung der Gesamtkirche sollten ihnen reichlich zu teil werden.

The Christian World

The Conference at Fano, Denmark

By the Rev. Frank Gavin, Th.D.
Professor of Ecclesiastical History, General Theological Seminary, and Associate Editor of The Living Church

European papers developed an unprecedented interest in the conjoint meetings of the Stockholm Council for Life and Work, the World Alliance of Friendship Through the Churches, and the Youth Movement, August 23d to 30th, at Fanö, Denmark. The interest of the press was due to a number of causes. For one thing, any vital effort toward Christian cooperation in these times of stress will elicit deep attention. For another, the subject matter of the Life and Work Council was the much discussed and controverted field of Church and State. Thirdly, it was clearly apparent that no other than remotely theoretical discussion of this last could avoid mentioning the German Church and State situation.

Fanö is about as remote a locality as one could think of for an international Church meeting. With the long stretches of sandy strand, the pounding of the North Sea, the unique Scandinavian sky colorings, abundant and thoughtful hospitality, the meetings settled down immediately to the business in hand. It is striking that two such "ecumenical movements" as that of Life and Work and that on Faith and Order should have come into common ground in the course of these years since Lausanne and Stockholm. It was found inevitable, for example, in developing a program of common action, to set up a theological research commission on the part of the Life and Work Movement. Equally inevitably have discussions as to practical matters intruded themselves into the World Conference on Faith and Order. Under Dr. Oldham's leadership the research committee of Life and Work prepared and presented a syllabus of studies to be undertaken. Much work on it had been done before the Conference met, and the sub-committee spent many hours between sessions in discussing the suggested scheme of study and investigation. Of the five general fields—under the caption Church and State—the first three were necessarily theological. This fact is of wide import, that antecedent to any sort of coherent action on the part of the Christian Churches the necessity of clear thinking must be duly recognized.

The opening session on Saturday was occupied by the arranging of the agenda, and then the chairman, the Lord Bishop of Chichester, read a communication from the Archbishop of Canterbury as honorary president. As the last paragraph contained the statement of principles bearing on the Church and State situation, direct reference to the

German Church and State conditions came to be made early in the proceedings. Dr. Bell then read some correspondence with Bishop Heckel of the Reichskirche of Germany—who was himself present together with three other official representatives of the State Church. Bishop Heckel spoke somewhat at length, diverting attention from the concrete problems before everyone, in an effort to direct it toward the principles at issue in the newly reorganized State Church. He asked that no other Germans be allowed to attend the evening meeting save the official delegation.

The atmosphere was heavily charged, for with such familiar and beloved figures so long identified with Life and Work as Dr. Deissmann absent, there was the greater disposition to favor the case of those not represented. Recent occurrences in Germany—the meeting of the Synod on August 9th and of the Barmen Synod of protest later that month—plus the several unhappy incidents, as for example those of Dr. Koch, whose papers and statistics were allegedly confiscated by the police, the removal of many of the dissident pastors from their posts, and many allegations of the use of force—sharpened the tone and temper of the discussions. Saturday evening was given up to what might be called the Case Against the State Church of Germany. Speaker after speaker ventilated, in great frankness and genuine friendliness, the grievances felt by their several public opinions with regard to recent events in Germany. While occasionally emotion was distinctly noticeable, every speech was courteous, direct, and in no sense actively hostile. But the feeling of general dissatisfaction was manifest and obvious. Bishop Heckel spoke again at length, attempting to put the discussion back in the domain of theological principle. It is to be doubted whether he carried many of his hearers with him.

On Monday the Conference returned to the agenda, with the stubborn practical problem of its attitude toward the German situation never out of anyone's mind. The chairman was a marvel of careful impartiality. Bishop Bell commanded the confidence of the whole group. The King Charles' head of the German situation again and again got into the Youth Conference, where, I was given to understand, most of the German youth were more in favor of the "Confessional Synod," the Barmen Group who are the dissidents from the Reichskirche under Bishop Müller. Bishop Heckel had as difficult a rôle as could be imagined, and next in difficulty was the delicate task of the chairman. The singular tact, benignant firmness, astute awareness, and clear-headedness shown by Dr. Bell were beyond praise.

The peculiar difficulty of the whole matter of this very timely topic of Church and State—which it was inevitable to cast in terms of such situations as Fascism in Italy, Communism in Russia, and Hitlerism in Germany especially—was due not only to the matter of understanding the facts, but to auxiliary conditions, as for example, the interest of the press. Despite every precaution lest unauthorized reports be relayed to the representatives of the newspapers, the Fanö Conference was altogether too much in the limelight. In general, of course, the Scandinavian and Swiss press, the French, and to a considerable extent the

British, were regarded by the Germans as overly hostile. This was so much the case that the German delegation protested forcibly on Wednesday, August 29th, saying in part: "It is a matter of grave concern to the German delegation to learn that confidential sessions of the Conference are being reported in a part of the world press. Such publicity has not only sensationalism in view and shows itself distinctly partisan in character, being hostile in attitude to German conditions, both in Church and politics, but also definitely seeks to influence the deliberations of the Conference itself and to create an atmosphere which precludes the freedom of expression indispensable to such discussions."

The declaration goes on to express its protest, and requests the president to employ every effort to secure an objective treatment of all disputed matters in the press. Bishop Bell agreed with the Germans that some of the papers had given a misleading impression of the Conference's discussion, and pledged himself to make an open explanation in the interests of objective and non-partisan accounts of the transactions and spirit of the Conference.

In a subsequent report it is hoped further to deal with the very difficult matter of the German situation. Suffice it here to make a few comments. There are, in the overt facts, sufficient numbers of unpleasant instances and extraordinary principles—as for example, "the Aryan paragraph" and the use of force with regard to religious matters—which demand interpretation. Further, there is no doubt whatever of the unique quality and the amazing vitality of the Hitlerite revolution —not only in matters political but also with reference to religion. It was touch and go for months, and there is little doubt but that the alternative to Hitlerism was chaos and eventual Communism. Abnormal times evoke abnormal methods. That is simple fact. I wondered just what Cranmer might have said in justification of some of Henry VIII's acts had he been questioned by foreigners whose acquaintance with conditions was in no sense intimate!

So I close this brief account with a few quotations. For example, one rather telling speech was made by a young Englishman, student in Germany, who said he would be a "German Christian" were he German, and challenged the non-German Churches to show how they had used their "liberty" (the alleged suppression of which constituted one of the chief grievances they had lodged against Germany) in the direction of true spiritual leadership. On Wednesday Bishop Heckel, replying to Prof. Runestan (of Upsala) who had maintained that the "Church must hold itself aloof, not only from the State but also from the life of the people, in an attitude both positive and critical," said in part: "The State, according to the New Testament, represents an institution divinely ordered, so to speak of a 'Christian' State is meaningless. Christian statesmen there may be and are, but not a Christian State. The German Third Empire (as this present régime is being called) represents the corporate will of the people. People and State constitute one single thing in Germany. The totalitarianism of the State does *not* mean absolutism, but this omni-competence ought rather be regarded as evidence of its consciousness of responsibility for all matters that

concern the people and their welfare. Consequently, compulsion and freedom must alike be bound together by the State in pursuance of this aim. The State sustains the divine order. The Church for her part must enter into the external reaches of the state life of both State and people, at the same time that she has the unique responsibility incumbent upon her to proclaim the Word of God to the whole people."

Prof. Geisinar (of Copenhagen) pointed out that sin rules in the life both of the State and the people. For example, the egotisms of a people and blind mass-suggestion can easily be bound up with religious idealism. Hence can easily arise a dangerous situation fraught with the possibility of martyrdom for the Church.

The venerable Dr. Titus (of Berlin) made a moving plea for a renewed confidence in Germany. "We must learn to win trust and confidence in each other. Germany needs that very confidence in her on the part of the foreign world. For foreigners to mix into the present difficult situation in Germany is intolerable to the Germans, for foreign help can be no help to us. We only can solve the tasks we have ourselves set. We have begun our post-revolution evolution, and you must give us time. The whole German situation is wrongly envisaged by the world outside; it is laughable to us when people imagine that personal liberty can ever be done away with in Germany. We are, after all, real Germans! We are in no sense a people fallen into the hands of thieves. Today we are nearer than before to the Ecumenical Movement. The achievement of peace and equal status is the goal set by the German people."—*Living Church.*

Symposium: The Church and Social Problems

What Is the Proper Business of the Church?

(From a Minister)

The leaders of the Church begin to see that the struggle to redeem our iniquitous social order will be long and arduous. Neither the inner motives which drive us to the seeking of private profit and selfish power, nor the outer forms of industrial and political organization through which we achieve profit and power, can be transformed magically, in the twinkling of an eye. Putting new words into our prayers, preaching labor day sermons on the need for social changes, passing resolutions at meetings of synods, conferences, and prebyteries,—these activities may mark the awakening of the minds of religious people to the fundamental injustices of our communal life, but we have come now to the place where we ask whether the Church must not go farther if its influence is to be made effective in directing social reconstruction.

Young people particularly are voicing discontent with words, prayers, hymns and resolutions. They urge the Church to commit itself openly to "the building of God's co-operative community," to an "identification with the disinherited and the workers of the world, whose struggle for justice leads to a classless society." They would pledge

themselves to "the fulfillment of the true missionary spirit" by refusing to take up arms against their "brothers of other lands at the command of national rulers."

At this juncture, when thousands of earnest Christians, young and old, feel that their deepest religious experiences drive them forward to new ventures in social rebuilding, we are asked by Dr. James H. Snowden, Chief Justice Hughes and other leaders to draw in our lines, to retreat to worship and "the nourishing of spiritual forces" in a safe sanctuary, to spend the moments of these desperate days in quiet study of ancient Scriptures, and to forego all Churchly participation in the effort to remake the world according to the patterns of Christ.

To follow such counsel would be the surest way to alienate our young people, to disappoint the adventurous spirits of the older generation, and to encourage both young and old to put their trust solely in other movements and organizations which are frankly committed to basic social reconstruction. It would confirm in many brave souls the opinion that the Church is a monastic institution, primarily and eternally concerned about private prayer and safe ritual, and incapable of making any contribution to the redemption of the social order. It might win to Church membership those whose religious interest is mainly in security and inward peace, but it would estrange the growing number of fine spirits who will not buy security and inward peace at the price of withdrawing from the bitter struggle of the poor, the disinherited and the oppressed. It would make the Christian religion a refuge and a covert from the winds, but while its devotees were keeping "out of the swamp and sea of settling the social order," millions of people would cry for bread and be given only the stone of relief. How can we keep out of the swamp and sea of the social order without running away from the human beings who make up the social order? It is hard to escape the conclusion that those who urge the Church to draw in its lines are urging it to impotence and futility and extinction. —*F. D. W.*

The Church and Social Problems

By a Pastor)

Chief Justice Hughes has rendered an inestimable service to the whole Church in calling attention to the proper sphere and function of the Church in human life. Our American courts very wisely refrain from rendering opinions on any issue except when a concrete case is presented, and then only after all the evidence has been presented and analyzed by competent lawyers. Far too often our Church judicatories pass judgment on social, economic, and even political issues, without either evidence or pleadings, and with only preconceived notions as a basis of judgment.

The old adage: "Let the shoemaker stick to his last," is still valuable. If a state bankers' association undertook to dictate the qualifications of candidates for baptism, or if the A. F. of L. presumed to formulate a new pericope for the Church, probably our sense of humor

would save us from apoplectic wrath. That our conduct is equally ridiculous when we oracularly give a deliverance on matters far beyond our sphere should be obvious and would be, were we not so greatly obsessed with the sense of our infallible omniscience.

But there are other reasons of far greater moment why the Church should refrain from dogmatizing on social, economic and political subjects.

1. It betrays a lack of faith in the power of the religious life, and of the gospel which we profess as the motive force of life. The work of the Church is salvation. We teach that men are saved by the power of a new life; and that new life is the creation of the Holy Spirit mediated by the preaching of the gospel. When we tell the world that a "new social order" is a prerequisite to salvation, we virtually confess a lack of faith in the gospel and in the power of the Spirit to transform mankind.

2. When the Church, both in the sessions of its judicatories and through the public press, declares itself on social, economic and political issues, it inevitably creates in the mind of the laity an exaggerated estimate of the importance of these minor matters, and a correspondingly low estimate of the value of the spiritual life.

3. Justice Hughes points out that an atmosphere of liberty is essential to spiritual culture. There are times when it is necessary for the individual minister of the gospel to proclaim boldly the principles of justice, truth and liberty; and he can do this with effect only when the ecclesiastical body of which he is a member has refrained from an ex-cathedra utterance which regiments both his speech and thought. We gain nothing in liberty when we substitute the ukase of a Synod for a bull of the Pope.

4. The Church is far from being in a position to lay down any rules or regulations for industry in such matters as living wages, unemployment insurance, old age pensions or any other of the pet theories of those who formulate "social service" resolutions for our Church judicatories. No other corporation on earth pays such low salaries to trained workers as does the Church. Ordained ministers more than any other workers are estopped from changing to other methods of attaining livelihood; yet the Church makes no provision whatever for the unemployed minister under seventy years of age. We have a pension system for aged or disabled ministers, and ministers' widows, who receive a stipend which averages somewhere between abject poverty and actual starvation. For other employes—organists, choir leaders, janitors and others—not only is the wage rate far below that which the Church demands of industry, but no provision whatever is made for the years that follow productive activity. "First cast the beam out of thine own eye and then shalt thou see clearly to cast the mote out of thy brother's eye." How any minister or elder can support the high-sounding resolutions on these subjects which we adopt annually, in any other than a Pickwickian sense, is beyond the comprehension of this writer.

This communication, which far transcends the 300 word limit set

by the "Messenger," is written in response to a request. It seemed desirable that the unpopular side be given by someone who honestly believes that the majority is not necessarily right. Coupled with the request was the suggestion that I need not sign my name; a letter or pen-name would be sufficient. In view of this hint, Mr. Editor, please permit me to subscribe myself,

Amos Oliver Reiter
St. John's Evangelical and
Reformed Church, Allentown, Pa.

Canon Streeter's Confession

Reporting the recent mass meeting of 2,000 persons in the Town Hall of Oxford, England, at the International House Party of the Oxford Group Movement, Dr. Albert C. Dieffenbach, of Boston, says: "*One of the greatest scholars and wisest men in Christendom did a momentous thing.*" He referred to Canon B. H. Streeter, the eminent Christian leader, who is now provost of Queen's College and one of the most famous writers in the field of the New Testament, author of *The Four Gospels*, *The Buddha and the Christ*, and that mighty little volume, *Reality*.

"My attitude toward the Oxford Group Movement," said Canon Streeter, "has been an attitude of benevolent neutrality and might be compared to that held by Gamaliel, the most amiable of Pharisees. But I have come to the conclusion that I must cease to take an attitude of benevolent neutrality. I have come to believe that *this Movement is the most important religious Movement at this time.* I have been watching it. It has been growing in depth and is wisdom, and its leaders have been doing the same. The most important thing is not where these leaders are, but in what direction they are moving. In a world full of despair there is, I know, a great deal of good will, but not enough to solve tremendous problems such as the class war. Men have been losing heart. The people are carrying on patiently, but they are losing courage. Speaking broadly, the Christian Churches are losing heart. Why is it that this Movement in such a time not only changes bad people into good people, but gives good people new heart and courage and a new sense of direction? *I feel it to be my duty to associate myself with this Movement because it has got on to the secret of giving people new hope and new courage*, and I come to this meeting not as a person with some little reputation in my field of study, or as the head of an Oxford College, but as one who has learned quite a lot from these people and hopes to go on learning, and to become more useful, if I may, hereafter."

Dr. Dieffenbach reports that this may well be set down as the outstanding event of this year's House Party, which brought together people representing more than thirty nationalities for a period of two weeks. They all rejoice at Canon Streeter's commitment, which will influence many. In successive issues of the *Boston Evening Transcript*, Dr. Dieffenbach reports on the outstanding personalities who range in

the world's estimate from working boys and girls to statesmen, titled persons and bishops, who are taking part with Dr. Buchman in this Movement, and who are "one in fellowship by the witness of the Spirit in their changed lives." Can any of us longer afford to minimize or discount the Oxford Group?—*Reformed Messenger.*

Anglo-Catholicism Infests the Diocese of Newark

Grace Church, Newark, and the House of Prayer Centers of This Insidious Movement in the Protestant Episcopal Church

Readers of *The Chronicle* have been made aware this year of the quiet but sure growth of the cult of Anglo-Catholicism in the Diocese of New York. It has been the hope of *The Chronicle's* roving reporter in this season's series of articles in Our Catholic Corner to acquaint Protestant Episcopalians with conditions in the minor "Catholic" parishes in the New York area and to arouse some of our loyal adherents to action so that this alien movement in our Church might be stamped out in short order and the clerical minority that has been foistering this growth upon us put in its place. Bad as conditions are in the New York area, it is unfortunate that the "Catholic-minded" have been spreading their cult of superstition and Italianate voo-doo throughout the whole breadth of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

The Diocese of Newark is just a tube journey from the cathedral of Anglo-Catholicism in the East, the famous Church of Saint Mary the Virgin and the abode of the Merry Monks of Saint Mary's. Fortified with pencil and paper and missionary zeal, your reporter braved the perils of the Hudson Tubes and traversed the industrial country side of north Jersey. When we arrived in the historic city we made at once for Grace Church. We had been told, dear reader, that Grace Church was on the up-and-up as far as Catholicism was concerned and that the Fathers in charge put on a regal Roman show. This we thought would please our readers and, perhaps, cause a few of our Jersey brethren to be on guard lest this nasty cult spread through their diocese with the speed with which it has recently infected the Diocese of New York. Grace Church is located on the main street of the city and occupies a vantage point in the centre of the fine business section of the town. The sign on the door of the church was one most humiliating for true Protestant Episcopalians, and one calculated to give undue emphasis to the eccentric rites of a small group in the Protestant Episcopal Church. We quote in detail the legend on the prominently located sign: "Holy Communion at 7:30; Children's Mass at 10; Matins at 10:40 and Sung Mass at 11." The list also included a Solemn Evensong for Sundays and the catchy postscript "Daily Masses." This, dear readers, is how the Protestant Episcopal Church is represented on Newark's business street. In the porch of the church a notice called attention to the fact that the Father Rector hears confessions at stated times or by "appointment." We wonder where they have the confessionals for in our inspection of the edifice we saw no

cupboard or cranny that might be used for this Romish device. When we opened the door a whiff of stale incense indicated that we were in one of the centers of Anglo-Catholicism. We looked about for some Holy Water stoups in which we had hoped to freshen up a bit after our arduous trip; but no, Grace has not come to this form of Catholic refreshment yet. The Rector was catechising the Sunday school as we entered. Like their brothers under the cassock, the Romanists, the Anglo-Catholic priests believe in training the children and feeding them noxious pabulum that it is most difficult for them to throw off when they reach the age of reason. Of course Romish doctrine is the usual fare and we remember being told by a curate in one of these parishes that Roman Catholic catechisms were frequently used. This Rector was impressing upon the minds of his charges the importance of the Mass. Said he: "The Mass represents Christ's death upon the Cross. Our Lord did not command us to say Evensong, but the Mass is the one service that He demanded that we celebrate. Catholic Christians must hear Mass every Sunday and on the greatest festivals." And this, dear reader, is being taught week after week in the Church Schools of the Catholic parishes throughout the Protestant Episcopal Church. Grace Church lives up to the Anglo-Catholic tradition for the garish and tawdry in church interiors. It is passing strange how these aesthetes that are so arty when it comes to designing and embroidering copes and chasubles display such miserable taste in their rococo embellishments. Stations of the Cross indicated that the sacred personally conducted tour can be followed in the heart of Newark. Here and there sanctuary lamps depended from the ceiling, containing the provocative red lights. Seven were before the high altar and one before the side altar. Two chapels flank the chancel, one dedicated to St. Mary and the other to St. Joseph. The former was done in the Calabrian manner and a gilded triptych surmounted the altar. The table contained a tabernacle and the lamp indicated that one of Newark's wonder workers had enshrined Christ there. The door to the tabernacle was covered with a most Victorian silk portiere and a lambrequin hung from the mensa. Eight candles were on the table to give some light in the dark place. A sanctus bell and hammer were nearby so that the faithful might be made aware as the sacred moments of the transubstantiation cult drew near. The altar of "Her Most Chaste Spouse" was less ornate than that of the Gran' Madre di Dio. A plush antependium and a bit of rare old Cluny lace just gave the proper touch to this spot. An Italian Madonna *con bambino* hung over the table. This was encased in a mammoth gold frame that would have awed a simple peasant from the hill country beyond Naples. There were a number of similar paintings about the crossing and chancel of the church. The high altar was certainly not lacking in candle power. Wax tapers galore is the cry of the Anglo-Catholics and Grace Church is no piker in this respect. A golden door led into the tabernacle in this altar, but as the sanctuary maids of all work merely nodded as they swept by in front of it we knew that the cupboard was bare. Soon a brace of acolytes in red made their appear-

ance and began the lighting of the candles. Matins were said and preparations were in progress for the *piece de resistance* of the morning, the Sung Mass. Twenty-two candles on this high altar were lighted for this travesty on the Lord's Supper. A procession of the choir marched in shortly to the strains of a Mozart andante. When they had taken their places in the stalls, they commenced a hymn to the tune of which the second procession chasséd in from the vestry door. This latter cavalcade included the Father Celebrant arrayed in an ample chasuble of generous cut. The servers in waiting wore white cotton gloves and red soutanes. The bearer of the smouldering incense pot had on a pair of gauntlets. What, no "asparagus?" We have become so used to the rite of the Holy Splashing in Anglo-Catholic parishes that we were shocked to note that at Grace this liquid refreshment had not yet come into fashion. The celebrant was now at the foot of the altar making his preparation with the customary bowing, fawning and wriggling. Next he mounted the steps and began the Rite of Fumigation. Not a devil nor a moth could have withstood the swings of this acrid smelling smudge. Just the thing, we thought, for our porch this summer when the mosquitoes get bad. The technique of this celebrant in the swishing of the tiny Vesuvius is to be mentioned and, like the man on the flying trapeze, we thought, he swings with "a well mannered ease." O alas, and alack. One of the candles was giving trouble. It sputtered and carried on until a daring acolyte snuffed it. Now, dear reader, we are in a quandary. Was the Mass a valid one, with one of the six office lights gone bad? O dear, to think that we really might have missed Mass that Sunday. The poor celebrant was so put out that he muffed his next aria and went horribly off key as he intoned collect after collect. At the gospel a second fumigation took place and the celebrant passed a few curls of the smoke over the Missal ere he sang from it. The Creed came next and we wondered how it was that the Fathers of Grace have not advanced the Gloria to a position in the beginning of the Mass. The Romans have it at the beginning of the Mass, and so do St. Mary's and St. Ignatius' and the Prayer Book orders it at the end of the Holy Communion. Here, you see, are a number of reasons why Anglo-Catholics love to introduce the Gloria right after the Kyrie. Throughout the Mass we were delighted at the change in the lighting effects. Now the nave was in darkness, now special lights played upon the celebrant and then again the whole chancel was bathed in light. We remembered the last time we dropped into the Radio City Music Hall for a ballet and we called to mind, as we sat in Grace Church, that Anglo-Catholics do afford a nice sort of ballet divertisement in the Protestant Episcopal Church. When the time came for the people to communicate the celebrant turned to the people, blessed them with the Host, and turned to the altar and consumed the Communion before any in the congregation could file to the altar rail. This done the blessing was given and the celebrant retired to the gospel side of the altar to recite the last gospel. No kiss of peace was given, and the only osculations that were part of the service were those that the celebrant from

time to time implanted on the mensa. On the way out the Father Rector in biretta and cassock greeted the folks as they passed out onto Broad Street.

While in Newark we decided to kill two birds with one stone and visit the other center of the cult, The House of Prayer. If it were possible to kill two parishes with one stone we certainly know two in Newark that would invite our aim. Across the railway tracks in a nondescript neighborhood lies this parish. The place is ancient and the rectory a building of historic interest dating from the days of the American Revolution. These were the days before Protestant Episcopal parishes bore on their door the notices that appeared on the entrance to The House of Prayer. The list included Low Masses, Sung Mass, E. P. & Benediction. The interior is dull, dank and dingy. A table offered the series of tracts by the Holy Cross Fathers. Colored Stations of the Cross point the faithful on a sacred jaunt. Side altars abound. On one of these is a crucifix encrusted with scores of paste rubies. Before the high altar a red lamp indicated that this parish too maintains the Preserved Wafer. Some forty or fifty candles were set on the table. More in numbers, we are told, than heads in the congregation at the estimable Sung Mass. Hither and yon were glass pots for the reception of pennies. The House of Prayer is raising an organ fund to which Anglo-Catholic readers of this page might wish to contribute. Send your mite to the Rector, The Hause of Prayer, Newark, N. J., and assist him in his drive for a "mile of pennies."

And so we took our leave of Newark in a sympathetic mood. Here too, Protestant Episcopalians must stand up and fight the menace that is threatening the very life of our church with its insistence on doctrines and superstitions that were cast off by thinking people at the time of the Reformation and which have no place in a modern world of intellectual freedom.—*The Chronicle.*

Bishop of Chicago Scores Buchmanism

Charges Group Movement Bears Marks of Pharisaism and That Title Is Confusing and Misleading

Chicago—Writing in the September *Diocese*, diocesan publication, Bishop Stewart of Chicago declares that the Oxford Group Movement bears marks of Pharisaism and that the title adopted by the followers of Buchmanism is "misleading and confusing."

The Bishop said:

"For years I have watched the development of this strange movement, read its literature, talked with its leaders, listened to its neophytes, analyzed its teachings, observed its influence, watched its results, and stood amazed to find among its enthusiastic adherents men and women for whom I hold a genuine respect.

"That any Churchman should be attracted by it fills me with a 'melancholy wonder.' One need not deny that it has helped many individuals to a life of greater religious reality. That may be equally

said of many another queer and dangerous cult. But Buchmanism bears upon it those marks of Pharisaism which Dean Hodges once described as principally two: content and contempt; a megalo-maniacal assurance and self-confidence, and a superior contempt for those who do not agree with its own peculiar and oracular theological terms. Its theology, reflecting that of its founder and leader, Dr. Buchman, is a naïve fundamentalist Lutheranism; its technique of 'guidance' is trivial and childish; its toadyism to the rich and prominent is vulgar and silly; its spiritual exhibitionism is offensive and dangerous. And most certainly it is not entitled to the name which after several experiments it has designedly adopted—The Oxford Group Movement—a misleading and confusing title which neither its history nor tradition nor discipleship justifies."—*Living Church.*

The Greater Gandhi

In his correspondence from India, published elsewhere in this issue, Mr. P. O. Philip tells of the split which has finally taken place in the Indian nationalist forces. An important group of high caste Hindus, let by Pandit Malaviya, has formed a party within the national congress party. Ostensibly this split has occurred over the constitutional proposals contained in the British white paper. The new party insists that the Britsh offer must be rejected more positively, fought more uncompromisingly, than the congress party under Mahatma Gandhi's leadership is doing. The communal awards in particular are denounced as something that must never be allowed to go into effect. But behind this disagreement over immediate political action, as Mr. Philip points out, there is something deeper in its meaning. The formation of the new party is really notice served by an important section of the orthodox Hindu community that it is no longer ready to follow Gandhi's leadership, since that leadership seems now primarily concerned with issues growing of the Indian caste system, and that it favors abiding by the ideal of an Indian society rigidly delimited as between castes and faiths.

This split in the movement which Mr. Gandhi has been leading will be variously interpreted in different quarters. Among British tories, who have been fighting the concessions of the white paper with stubborn ferocity, belief will revive that the day of empire is not yet drawing to its close, and that the old strategy of "divide and rule" can still be relied on to preserve imperial authority over this vast subcontinental domain with its 350,000,000 subjects. Mr. Churchill and Lord Lloyd will return to the charge at Westminster with the chances greatly increased that they can secure a further whittling down of the white paper concessions before final action is taken by parliament.

Political observers in general are likely to see in this development evidence for their oft-repeated charges as to the political impracticability of Gandhi, and another prophecy of his impending displacement as India's most powerful political leader. By turning aside from the

immediate issues raised by the British white paper to a campaign on behalf of the untouchables, they will hold, the mahatma has committed the fundamental political error of dividing his strength between two objectives, and so has lost what chance he had of leading the congress party to a great victory in pursuit of its major goal. Having thus proved his political ineptitude, it is inevitable that party leadership should pass to other hands, since no political leader can maintain power in defeat if that defeat has been suffered in a cause for which the majority of his followers had no consuming enthusiasm.

Here and there, students of the changing orient will see in the division of the Indian nationalists a portent of more tragic disturbances in India a decade or so hence. Tempted by the lack of Indian cohesion, they will expect Britain to reduce her concessions to a minimum. They will expect the present congress party in India gradually to lose importance. They will find no difficulty in believing that ten years of comparative calm may descend on India, with the British rule apparently restored to security. But the continuation of the economic despair of India's millions, along with the gradual permeation of the Indian population by the revolutionary ideas which are now loose throughout Asia, they will expect eventually to bring a day when another nationalist uprising will break out. And that uprising, contemptuous of all preaching of non-violence, will plunge India and Britain alike into bloodshed.

Meanwhile, neither India, Britain nor the world at large comprehends what, with regard to Mahatma Gandhi, is happening before its eyes. Gandhi's original crusade to win India's freedom by resort to non-violent non-cooperation caught world imagination. Everywhere in the occident, a generation nauseated with the arbitrament of arms, and skeptical of its claims to finality, caught a glimpse of the possibility of a new method of political action in the sight of patriots submitting to lathi charges, imprisonment and impoverishment without resorting to physical retaliation. That phase of Gandhi's leadership the world may have rejected as impractical, but it was at least respected as important. Today, however, Gandhi is carrying his crusade into a realm of spiritual meaning far deeper than he penetrated with his doctrine of non-violence, yet there is grave reason to fear that its spiritual implications will hardly begin to appear, either inside India or without, until several decades have passed. Yet ours is a generation which supremely needs to perceive the prophetic religious nature of Gandhi's present course.

To understand this new Gandhi, who watches today in sadness while a portion of his following rejects his leadership, it is necessary to fix firmly in mind the fact that he has conceived freedom for India as a spiritual blessing as well as a political goal. All struggles for liberty are, of course, proclaimed in similar terms, but in the case of Gandhi the proclamation and the fact have been one. Politics has been, for him, a field for spiritual adventure and achievement. And in the early stages of his leadership of the Indian nationalist cause he evidently believed that all India was ready to embark on a course which,

while it would have glorious political consequences, would be always at heart spiritual. Before that faith is too lightly derided, it should be admitted that the masses of India did respond to the mahatma's spiritual challenge to a degree without historical precedent, and that history will, as a result, be vitally affected by the example of the non-violent movement which so shook the Britsh power.

But as Gandhi penetrated more deeply into the nature of the nationalist crusade, he came to see its inescapable relation to the fate of India's *untouchables*. To win for India some great goal by virtue of the operation of "soul force" required of India a prior purification of her own soul. And how could the soul of India be ready for national independence while 60,000,000 of her people were damned from birth to an existence hardly better than that of the animals? What right had India to demand democracy when she was unwilling to grant democracy to her own people? Reflecting on the fate of the untouchables in the periods of contemplation which have filled so large a part of his career, the mahatma came to believe that India could have no firm spiritual basis for seeking her rights at the hands of Britain until she had herself righted the unspeakable wrongs which she has inflicted on her own outcaste children.

The result has been the astounding—to most orthodox Hindus—turning aside from the direct drive against British domination to the *harijan* (untouchable) campaign of Gandhi's last two years. In the very hour when Britain was in the act of formulating constitutional grants, the mahatma marched off to grapple with an internal social issue which is almost as old as Indian life. The results have been memorable. Despite the opposition of the orthodox religious groups, at first incredulous and then angry, Gandhi has stirred India to its core on the sin of maintaining untouchability. In two years he has almost succeeded in cracking wide open an unjust social order that had defiantly resisted challenge for centuries.

But he has done this at the expense of the unity and the driving power of the national congress movement. Many of his closest associates in that movement have been quite unable to understand why he should have turned aside to thus endanger the campaign for *swaraj*. Toward the question of the untouchables the typical nationalist attitude has been: "This is an internal problem. Let us wait until India is free and then we will deal with it." Even socially-minded nationalists have insisted that it was unfair to ask India to clean out the social evils within her household until she was master there. To all of which the unyielding answer of the mahatma, passing from village to village in his pursuit of justice for the outcastes, has been: "*India is not fit for freedom*, and freedom will be worth nothing to her, until we have *done away with this foul thing* within her own life!"

In that answer the greater Gandhi appears. Will the eyes of our desperately needy generation see him? For here he has once more challenged the spiritual stupor of mankind. He did it before with his claim that the achievement of vast national purposes is not dependent upon resort to force. Here he penetrates to an even more greatly

needed spiritual principle, namely, that the doing of justice must precede the gaining of justice. He stands in the direct succession of that prophet who saw that judgment must begin in the house of God, and of the even greater prophet who saw that blessing at the altar requires a prior establishment of right relations with the socially wronged.

Lest there be any confusion of this demand which Mahatma Gandhi is making for the inner purification of India with the sort of retreat into an other-worldly personal mysticism which, in other parts of the world, is being presented as the essence of religion's contribution to our contemporary need, it is to be noted that the "Inward, ho!" call which Gandhi has addressed to his followers has been a call to acute social struggle, to the immediate and bitterly opposed redressing of overt social wrong. There is a profound mysticism in Gandhi's conviction that India's attainment of freedom must wait upon her granting freedom to those of her own children upon whom she has bound the chains of her caste system. But it is the mysticism of the sermon on the mount.

What our generation therefore needs to see in India at this hour is that, as Gandhi appears to the superficial eye to be fading out of the political picture, he is actually offering mankind a revival of prophetic insight. He really is penetrating to the lowest depths of India's basic spiritual problem, and in so doing he is providing food for meditation for those in every land who believe that the crisis in history in which we are now involved requires that religion shall place itself in the forefront of a new struggle for human freedom. Will India follow Gandhi, subjecting herself to the searching examination and agonizing changes which are involved in righting the wrongs of her own untouchables, before she presses on to demand the righting of her national wrongs? It is not likely. But even more important is the question whether those who demand liberation in religion's name in other parts of the world will face the implication of the insight which Gandhi's *harijan* movement offers. Will they see that a successful onslaught by religion on the injustices of a pagan social order requiries a prior dedication of religion itself to the cleansing of its own relations with the system which it sets itself to redeem?

Christian Century.

Book Review

Reviews when not signed are by the Editor.
NOTE: When ordering books, please mention MAGAZINE.

Today's Youth and Tomorrow's World, by *Stanley High.* Friendship Press, New York, 1933, 186 pages.

This book professes to have originated in the young people's society of a church. This society was a long time of little use to its members and almost a rock of offence to the older people until its leaders had a great vision. They came to see that the world in general judged Christianity and the Church by its fruits, by the effects it has on individual and social life, not by its professions or claims. Furthermore, that there were a great many areas where at present Christianity is either doing nothing to improve a bad situation or making only feeble efforts. Youth is the time of ideals, enthusiasm and courage, and the youth of the Church ought to be in the forefront wherever a campaign for civic betterment of for the advancement of the kingdom of God is under way. So this particular society had its eyes opened and began to do real work.

A person doesn't have to go to China, India or Africa to apply Christian principles. We find chances for solving great problems right over our back fences. There is the foreigner within our gates. Has the Church nothing to say if he is exploited by the employers of cheap labor? Can the Church keep away from politics and yet be Christian? It seems almost impossible to get the average church member to take an active part in the work of cleaning out the augean stables of city politics. But Cincinnati and Milwaukee have recently done it and the youth of these cities has taken an honorable part in it.

The author keeps close to mother earth in all he says. His experience is many-sided. He has been all over the world and can furnish illustrations from the most distant parts of the globe. It is no wonder that he can report that his young people's society began to be a real help and source of pride to its church. Not every young people's society has the privilege of such leadership. Nor is youth always so ready and capable of doing progressive work. Often enough all they are after is having a good time. Still this book will be found a source of inspiration to serious youth leaders. It shows the way to what can be done and how it can be done.

The author says in conclusion: "There is little of Christ and his New Testament in some of the youth movements of the world. A new one is called for: a youth movement that accepts Jesus' program as its platform and which takes Jesus' spirit as its driving power. If enough of today's young people will read this book and start such a crusade they may make it a success in tomorrow's world."

Beyond Fundamentalism and Modernism: The Gospel of God, by *George W. Richards*, D.D., LL.D., D.Th., Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York and London, 1934, 333 pages. $2.00.

That neither Fundamentalism nor Modernism can offer an adequate solution of the theological problem is the conviction of perhaps the majority of wide-awake ministers. Fundamentalists want to keep the faith "once delivered to the saints" intact. If they are Presbyterians they are not willing to go beyond the Westminster Confession; if they are Lutherans they will stand by the unchanged Confession of Augsburg. The Modernists adopt a critical attitude toward Bible and Creeds. They made the needs and thoughtforms of the man of today their standards of judgment. There is a tendency in the churches at large to keep the divergent views from breaking into destructive strife. But certainly if a position could be found that would conserve the good in both camps and avoid the errors, it would be much to be desired. Dr. Richards has found such a solution for himself.

A long process of development has led him by way of Schleiermacher, Ritschl and Troeltsch to Barth and Brunner and this latter pair seem to have given him the higher vantage ground towards which he was striving. In other words, he has become a disciple of Barth. With Barth he puts heavy emphasis on the transcendence of God. There is no way from man to God, only from God to man. It is God who seeks man, not man seeking God. What God has to give man, is a great message, good news, gospel, the gospel *of God* because it comes from God and tells about God. This gospel could not have come into the mind of man by the study of nature, nor could it have been read off the process of history. Neither man's reason nor his esthetic feeling nor even the feeling of the "numinous" could have enabled him to get into possession of God. Only the fact that God revealed himself as the God of love made possible this gospel of God. The prophets of the Old Testament and Jesus and his apostles in the New Testament are the vehicles of this revelation. All these messengers were of the Jewish race, but it was not the religious genius of the Jews that was responsible for their message. God made use of them for his purpose, but the gospel was his, not Israel's. We can see how this stress on revelation is opposed to the modernistic contention that revelation in the old sense is a view more and more to be relegated to the things that are out of date. As a result of the new emphasis on revelation, Dr. Richards makes an abundant use of the word of God. His pages fairly teem with scriptural quotations. One is reminded of the Master himself who again and again beats off the tempter or refutes his arguments with an "It is written," "Again it is written . . . ."

"The ancient and modern attempts of philosophy, science and theology to reach God, who is revealed through the prophets and the Christ, by way of the cosmic process are more and more recognized as leading us into a blind alley. The use of philosophy and science in defence of Christianity against its antagonists is at once to confess

defeat. The philosopher and the scientist can vanquish the Christian when the latter uses the weapons of the former. The Christian can put the army of the alien to flight only when he uses the strategy of his Master—preaching, teaching, healing, that is, living in faith, hope and love. A frontal attack with the enemy's weapon will invariably fail; but the presentation of weapons that are not carnal but spiritual—a sincere Christian life—will not subdue but will probably win the enemy. In Christian living, after the opponent is won, there is endless room for the most penetrating philosophic thought, the most accurate scientific research, and indefatigable use of the result of science in practical Christianity."

Going along with Barth, it is not surprising that the social gospel in the American sense does not occupy such an important place in Richards' system. The Kingdom of God is God's rule in the hearts of men, he says, God's creative and redemptive power. This Kingdom is at hand because Christ is here. It is coming through the will of God, and it is for men. It does not come with ethical idealism or by Jewish apocalypticism. If as a result of modern movements all enjoy greater comfort and a better distribution of material welfare, or if even the efforts for the abolition of war should be successful, that would not represent the Kingdom of God. It would be a very desirable by-product, but the Kingdom of God is the rule and victory of the will of God in the hearts of men: all those benefits mentioned in the social gospel might be enjoyed without a regeneration of the individual enjoying them.

On the subject of apocalypticism Richards does not seem to go quite so far as Barth has done. Richards says we don't expect Christ coming in the clouds of heaven. The Barthians put extreme weight on eschatology. They claim the whole New Testament is eschatological and the church ought to be. "We should get ready for ultimate questions and answers, should wait for and hasten towards final decisions, should listen for the sound of the last trumpet, which gives notice of the truth beyond the graves. To believe means to hope for the kingly rule of God, the new world of God where there will be no suffering, no death anymore" (Petersmann).

Richards we say, is not quite so eschatological as Barth and Brunner. He has also spared us the terrible paradoxes with which Barth exasperates us. Nor does he—as far as we know—condemn Methodism, Pietism and Mysticism quite so extremely and undeservedly. Other points might be mentioned that "the American climate" induced Richards to tone down in Barth's dialetic frenzy. In that way Richards has succeeded in removing some of the difficulties in the American mind regarding the Barthian theology. We are all well aware that there are many things in this theology that will deter the ordinary American student and theologian. At the same time the world seems to be a unit as to the merits of this new prophet of the "religion of crisis." How fortunate therefore that a man of Dr. Richards' caliber and influence endeavors to be a bridge-builder between Americans and Barth and his school.

Richards is professor of church history at the Lancaster, Pa. Seminary and the first president of the new Evangelical and Reformed Church. He ought to be able to win many new friends for the Swiss theologian. We wish him abundant success and thank him for letting us see how deeply Barth has stirred him. May the swing towards Barth in America, so long delayed, now soon come.

God at Work. A Study of the Supernatural by *William Adams Brown*, Ph.D., D.D. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1933. 301 pages.

In the author's opinion there is noticeable at the present time a greater interest in personal religion. He finds evidences for this fact in the wide-spread influence of the Barthian theology, in the Anglo-Catholic movement in the Episcopal Church, and in the impression made in different countries by the First Century Christian Fellowship (Buchmanism). There can be no doubt, the writer claims, that along these various lines God may be said to be *at work*, i. e. that he is making himself known as a God who has not withdrawn from mankind when the last apostle met his martyrdom, or at the end of any other era. He is producing effects now, his activity is creative; the response which he evokes from individuals and groups is as positive and real as it ever was.

It is impossible to reach God by the instruments or the experiments of science, or by the speculations of philosophy. This does not mean that science and philosophy can afford no help at all in the understanding of religion. After one has got in touch with God by the intuition of faith and surrendered his will to the divine approach, philosophy and science will enable him to show the reasonableness of religion. But God himself is a supernatural fact and can therefore be laid hold on only by faith. The author all through the book emphasizes this fact. The tendency with many scholars is towards ruling out the supernatural from the discussion. The writer considers it his task to resist this with all his might. And since he fights for the supernatural he can't get along without the miraculous although he knows well that this term is just as offensive as the other.

However, his conception of the miracle is not that of something involving a breach of a natural law. A miracle, he says, is an exceptional event in which faith sees the self-revealing activity of God; it is a sign, a strange fact with a divine meaning. The scientific man is interested in the cause of an event, the religious man in its meaning. The persistent faith in miracles is a striking witness to a man's stout refusal to believe himself alone in the universe. Through miracle man becomes conscious of a fresh accession of power, it introduces him to the creative aspect of religion. Protestantism has confined the operation of miracle within holy writ. Catholicism has not been so squeamish. The miracles done by the saints and in holy places stretch through all the history of the church. The author seems to approve of this more generous course of Catholicism. This is in keeping with his very irenic and tolerant spirit manifested throughout the volume.

Whether Roman or Anglo-Catholic, whether scientist or philosopher, he finds something commendable in all of them.

He battles valiantly, among other things, with the old difficulty of the existence of evil in a world created by a loving God. The solution—or part solution—he offers is this: The Christian learns in Christ to conquer the evil within and hopes that the evil without may also be overcome one day.

Let us give a line to his conception of faith: Faith is an act of will by which we entrust our lives to the control of an unseen yet friendly presence of whose reality we are sure.

Reviewer has been most impressed by the chapters which deal most directly with the personal religious life, chapter IV "What the life of faith is like," and chapter V, "The basis of faith in the nature of man."

Dr. Brown has written a great many other books, among the more recent: "Pathways to Certainty"; "Beliefs that Matter"; "The Life of Prayer in a World of Science," etc. The readers of those will welcome gladly the advent of this new book, and reviewer wishes that it might move them as much as it has moved him and help them to find in God "mystery, authority and sufficiency."

Statesmanship and Religion, by *Henry A. Wallace,* Secretary of Agriculture of the United States. Round Table Press Inc., New York, 1934, 139 pages.

It is not often that our statesmen enter the lecture field, but Mr. Wallace has done so and in this little volume he gives us the three lectures he delivered before the Chicago Theological Seminary this year, and the substance of a talk given before the Federal Council of Churches in December, 1933.

The title indicates that Mr. Wallace is persuaded that statesmen can't do their work successfully without the aid of religion. The very first lecture deals with "the spiritual adventure of the Old Testament prophets." In an interesting chapter he briefly outlines the task of the eighth century prophets especially. He emphasizes that these men were not only concerned with the personal piety of the individual. They applied the principles of justice to all social relationships. The Israelites were not only to walk humbly before their God but also to do justly and love mercy. And some of the prophets envisaged a future in which war would be abolished and the nations live together as children of the one God and father. What gave these men their astonishing influence was their burning conviction of having God on their side and being able to deliver their message with a "thus saith the Lord."

In the next chapter he discusses the great religious Reformers. Of Luther he says little. It is our impression that he does not deal adequately or fairly with the great hero of the Reformation. He mentions his limitations, as e. g. in Luther's treatment of the rioting peasants and his leaning on the princes. But he is more interested

in Calvin and John Knox. They have also their great shortcomings pointed out, but their personalities, he says, were so overwhelming and their convictions so rocklike that they have imprinted their character on their own and future ages. To them and their leadership he attributes the intellectual emancipation of the modern age, the development of science and the rise of capitalism. The religious emancipation was followed by the intellectual, political and economic forward movements.

This burning conviction of being God-sent, of having a divine message is absent from the men of our age. We have no such men who speak to their time with anything like the authority of the prophets or the Reformers. But, he goes on to say, we will have them when the pressure of the time and the sufferings of the millions will have produced them. Our forefathers lived in a time when all the strength of body and mind was needed to assure them of a decent living. We live in a time of abundance and we haven't learned to live with abundance. We lack the social machinery to help us distribute, fairly, the fruits of our labor.

To develop a social technique that will be intelligent and flexible enough to take care of the often conflicting needs of the various groups in the national economy, will be a task stupendous in its magnitude. But it has to be undertaken and why should we doubt its feasibility? Religion will have to lend a hand, but it will have to be a religion that is concerned with life and righteousness, not with selfish interests or outmoded conceptions.

The author says in conclusion that no matter how well we succeed in a readjustment of the social structure of the nation, there is still the problem of the human hearts. If they continue to be selfish and contrary all our efforts will be futile. Since, however, very likely human hearts are to remain essentially what they are now, and since the author doesn't tell us how to change them, his hope for better times and creative achievement does not seem to rest on an all-round stable basis.

Nevertheless, while the author has no startling revelations to make on religious statesmanship, he has an originality of touch and a clarity of style that will be appreciated by the reader.

The Better Part. A Plea for Personal Religion by *Lyman P. Powell.* The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Publishers, Indianapolis, 1933. 212 pages.

The author is rector of St. Margaret's Episcopal in a section of a million and a quarter people, where few Protestant Christians remain and where this church serves a dozen races. According to Dr. MacFarland (in "Christian Unity in Practice and Prophecy") St. Margaret's people have gone a long way in revealing the possibility of making a Protestant Episcopal Church a house of prayer for all people. Another writer says, St. Margaret's is a "common denomination for people whose religion bears many labels." The rector is possibly the chief reason for

this result, for it would be hard to find a man whose time and heart are more at the service of everyone who needs it than the author, or one whose Christian love is more inclusive. He finds some good in all systems; he has even a special appreciation for Christian Science and for Mary Baker Eddy, its founder. He considers her the foremost woman America has produced, and thinks that her basic idea that only the spirit and spiritual things are real has been largely vindicated by the leading men of modern science. Again and again he returns to the praise of this cult, admiring its growth, its people, their interest in the cause, their use of the Bible, their literature and press. He never utters a word of censure, in all an attitude that we cannot altogether share. Still, in private the rector would possibly admit that there are shadows to the picture, too. However, it is his way to give credit where credit seems due, rather than pick out flaws.

The "better part" in the title is what Mary of Bethany was looking for, more love for Jesus, or, as the subtitle suggests it, religion more *personalized*, more active, more transforming. In a chapter entitled, "A widening usefulness" the author describes his work in his parish. Preaching and worshiping are naturally his most important fields of activity; but situated as his parish is, his "community service" must call for an enormous part of his time and energy. He is also interested in spiritual healing and has practised it to quite a large extent. He quotes a number of cases where the body or the mind of the patient received great benefit from such treatments when the doctors had given up all hope of relief.

He doesn't seem to be interested so much in the "social gospel" in the ordinary sense. He says, "people come to church not to take sides in political issues but to find inspiration and power to live the life of God within. If they live it within, they will express it without in their family, their social and political relations. Their voting then will match their preaching. No longer will they need, as now, the informing exhortations of the social prophets."

The minister, he thinks, should not direct his church and its organizations from the "swivel chair" in the office. He should be up and doing, a house-going minister to make a church-going people. He believes that in this time of disillusionment and hardship there is a vast and steady return to church-going to be noticed, if only the church is willing to give up ecclesiastic shadow-boxing and cultivate the "emerging essentials." He gieves a chapter to these, speaking beautifully and convincingly of the trend to church unity, of faith, prayer and the Bible.

An earnest, appealing and stimulating book and the writer a thoroughly likable personality. Life, he says, has for him never been "one grand sweet song," but for many years it has been usually free from petty striving, idle struggling to satisfy ambition's claims, and with few interruptions filled with that peace of God which passeth all understanding.

The reader will find the reading of this book a spiritual tonic.

The March of Eleven Men, by *Frank S. Mead.* The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Indianapolis, 1932. 236 pages.

At a time when there is so much criticism of the church it is well to strike a proper balance by considering also the good the church has done. The critics have gone too far. For instance, Llewelyn Powys, who said, "We have pretended long enough. Christianity is but a dream of savagery and pitifulness." Within our own hearing we have heard a brother say that there was no organization in the knowledge of man that had so far forgotten its original purpose and so corrupted its very nature as had the Christian Church. Over against such wild statements it is but fair to lend attention to a writer who points out the great and undeniable services he church has performed.

Somewhat in the spirit of the "Gesta Christi" of an earlier period, the book before us unfolds the bright chapters the history of Christianity contains. The author calls it "the March of Eleven Men," meaning by that the movement started under God by the eleven disciples of the Lord. The very reference to the fact of its humble origin and its very human protagonists makes it all the more evident that there was a divine power and guidance behind it.

In the opening chapters the development of the first three centuries is described. The author gives a vivid impression of the Roman empire as it was at that time. Its great services in the unification of the race, its laws and order, its military roads and world-wide administration are duly appreciated, but its vices and decay also are placed in a pitiless light. We all e. g. know about the cruelty of some of the public games of the Romans, but who ever heard that the emperor Trajan sent 10,000 pairs of gladiators to Rome to provide entertainment for the populace, ending in the killing off of all of them, after one hundred and eighty days of bloodshed!

What the Christianity of that time did for humanity is given full credit, and Emperor Constantine receives his due meed of praise. He may not have been a genuine personal Christian, but it was he who made the first Sunday law thereby benefiting the poor and the slaves. He and other "Christian" emperors passed the laws protecting new born babes from being abandoned, raising the status and rights of mothers, giving the prisoners proper treatment. And the inspiring source of all these measures was the gospel of Jesus Christ.

So the author goes on with the march of the "Eleven." After Rome passes, the darkness of barbarism settles on the Roman world, but the church performs the task once done by the empire. The Middle Ages with their light and deep shadows are portrayed. After the Reformation and Puritanism the reader is taken to "new shores." America occupies the center of the interest. He pays a glowing tribute to Washington Gladden and to that "grand old prophet of Rochester," Walter Rauschenbusch, the pioneers of the social gospel.

"Christianity," he concludes, "rests its case on what it has done from Pentecost to the present hour. Sketchy and incomplete as it is here presented, it yet seems to show that civilization, without the salt and light of Christian influence, would never have reached the peak

on which it rests today." In striking and impressive sentences he sums up the case for Christianity. The Lord who has done so much through his church in the past will be with her in the future and she can draw on his limitless resources for the work that is hers now.

The book giving a history of the different periods of the world in the story of its great men, makes the reading a pleasure and is apt to give to faith in the future new strength and resiliency.

The Christian Message for the World Today. A Joint Statement of the World-Wide Mission of the Christian Church. Round Table Press, Inc., New York, 1934. 203 pages, $1.50.

Ten men of note, such as E. Stanley Jones, John A. Mackay, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Basil Mathews, Henry P. Van Dusen, Luther A. Weigle, etc., are the contributors to this volume. Their task is to study the present world situation and to find how the Christian message must be adapted to it. Van Dusen opens the discussion with a paper on the "Mood of Our Generation." His argument lays heavy emphasis on the position that science holds in the present world. Our age is one of science to such an extent that every other consideration and interest must be submitted to the dictates of science. Religion must be interpreted in conformity with the latest conclusions of secular thought. Every belief or expression of belief that seems to have no scientific basis is considered archaic. As a consequence theology was never so little regarded as it is today. A philosophical world view that brings the different approaches to ultimate reality into harmony is impossible from this standpoint.

Applied science has done so much in teaching us to use the laws and forces of nature in the mastery of the material means of life, that the realization of the Kingdom of God, superficially conceived, seemed to be almost in sight. A mood of optimism had taken possession of the leaders of thought and still more of their public.

The War and what followed have blasted this extreme optimism. The world today is disillusioned. We see the limits of the powers of science now. Young people, especially, are imbued with "Weltschmerz." They don't care so much for the old ideals of modernism, freedom of inquiry, etc. if one could only give them inner strength and peace, "integration" of personality.

Since religion, in its modernistic conception particularly, appeared to have failed to fulfil the hopes of the world, substitutes have been looked for and found in communism and nationalism. It is Basil Mathews and Francis P. Miller who discuss these two movements, so strong in Russia and present-day Germany. Their good points are readily granted. Still, to build a whole nation's life on an irreligious basis, or to make religion and church nothing but a tool of the state, can lead only to an impoverishment of life and a prostitution of religion.

What can the gospel do for the world today? And how should it be offered in order to meet the tremendous demands of the situation? John A. Mackay (whom unfortunately we don't know) has an inter-

esting article on this question. He strikes a personal note. As a boy he passed through a deep conversion experience. He found in Jesus the Savior, the one in whom forgiveness of sin is offered, the one who united us with God. But later, coming to South America, he noticed that this God-ward side of religion was well emphasized there, but that the man-ward part was neglected, i. e. religion as changing our relation to our fellows. In other words, what we now call the social gospel. Modernism was very friendly to the social gospel, but regarded Jesus only as the example and inspiration. A combination of Paul's teaching of Jesus, the Son of God, with the gospel's emphasis on the Kingdom of God, come with Jesus, would furnish the religious dynamic for a better world.

Stanley Jones closes the discussion with a paper on the "Motives of Missions." Christian Missions should be entirely free from Western imperialistic expansion. We should show Christ standing, not as the representative of white rule, but as the brother of men. We should go with the outlook and spirit of preserving all that is fine and noble in the national culture of the nations to which we go. This does not mean that the end is to be a syncretism. That would spell weakness and not strength. In Jesus Christ we have discovered a moral and spiritual ultimate, and he preserves all that is fine in all nations. The church in order to give strength to its message must be a united church. Its aim should be conversion, i. e. change of heart and character, not proselytism, which is change from one sect to another without inward change.

The contributors in this book may hold divergent views on some of the matters considered. But they are agreed in finding Jesus Christ to be the key to the meaning of life and the universe, the self-revelation of the very heart of God. They are agreed in regarding evangelism —the witness to what Christ means to them—as the heart of their missionary task. They hold no easy-going optimism about human progress, but that the Christian Church, by reason of its very gospel, can do no less than witness to and work for the creation of a world society permeated in every respect of its life by the spirit of Jesus Christ. They have endeavored to set forth a message rooted in the imperishable truth of Christ and relevant to the problems of today and tomorrow.

The School of Charity. Meditations on the Christian Creed by Evelyn Underhill. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York, 1934. 111 pages.

Miss Underhill is a lover of mysticism as shown by her other books, "Mysticism" and "The Golden Sequence." She is not a mystic in the strict sense, who is an isolated individual, not caring for organizations or church or creed or a historic revelation, contained in a holy book. But she is a lover and student and promoter of the inner life, emphasizing saintliness as the goal of life, not so much interested in the change of environment to make Christian life easier, but in overcoming a hostile and trying environment by the power of faith and love.

That she is a mystic with a deep faith in the Bible, the church, the creed, she proves by this book which in its three chapters makes the treasures of devotion to be found in the three articles of the creed available for the soul's growth and nourishment. To her the creed is a "list of spiritual truths to which our inner life is conformed." Its object is to tell us of God, his creative, rescuing and indwelling, transforming love. He is the creator of life and of all that surrounds this life, of the whole world, physical and spiritual. The central fact about him is that he is Love, or rather, "Charity." And he who dwelleth in Charity dwelleth in God and God in him. God is present in this world of his and trying to find him has been properly called to "practice the Presence of God." Such an attitude calls for a "very high level of loving, admiration, self-oblivion, gentleness and faith—a certain child-like loyalty and humble awe, in the darkest moments as well as in the best."

To believe in God as the One Lord is to forget all distinctions. As we look into the lives of the saints we learn what that means. It means everything else in life subordinated to this one fact; no exceptions. "It means Francis Xavier and David Livingstone traveling for Him to the ends of the earth, and Father Wainright living for half a century in one slum; Bunyan going to prison for Him. . . . Elizabeth Fry facing the criminals in New Gate jail and Charles de Foucauld going out into great spaces and dying alone in the desert with his love."

In passing on to the second article, the author calls attention to the fact that Christ's humanity was absolutely real, that much in his own destiny was deeply mysterious to him. He shared our entire dependence. "The New Testament narrative, with its emphasis on moments when the clouds parted, and he saw his call and what was at work in him seems to suggest by contrast other, longer stretches, when he looked out from his earthly tabernacle on no clear view but a path to be trodden in pure abandonment to God."

The Cross, naturally, is the occasion for deep searching of its inmost meaning. The writer does not present a special view of the atonement for sin. She seems to see in it chiefly the supreme manifestation of his love for God and man and his willingness to pay the price of suffering and death. The Suffering Servant, bearing the world's griefs and carrying its sorrows is the one who most perfectly conveys the Divine Charity and serves his brethren best. And "if any one will come after me, let him take up the Cross." Union with the Cross means that only those who are willing to accept suffering up to the limit are capable of giving love to the limit. It is only on Good Friday, and only then, that the ancient liturgies hail Christ as the strong, the Holy, the Immortal; as if this crisis alone could disclose in its fulness his mysterious power. The Food that Christ gives eternally to men has been won by the costly exercise of a heroic love.

Beautiful words of interpretation the author has for the resurrection and she does not tell us to be satisfied with the victory of Christ's cause, leaving his body to take care of itself. Even the "descensus ad inferos" she seems to let stand: "He comes with an irresistible rush,

bearing the banner of redemption to the imprisoned souls of those who know him not."

God—Christ—Spirit—Church—Eternal Life, such is the Christian sequence. No link in this chain can be knocked out without breaking the current of love which passes from God through his creatures back again to God. The incarnation of the Holy in this world is social. We are each to contribute our bit to it and each to depend on the whole. The whole Body is the Bride of Christ, a Body having different members, some of a very odd shape, some of a very lowly kind.

The book is apt to feed the flames of devotion and prayerful meditation in those who lead an inner life. It will help some more when taken in small doses. We have thought to recommend it best by frequent quotations. The author loves saintliness wherever she finds it; she feels especially at home with the mystics of the Catholic Church.

God's Adventurers, by *Marjorie Hessell Tiltman.* With thirty-two Illustrations in Half-Tone. London, Geo. G. Harrap & Co. Ltd. 1933, 318 pages.

This is a most inspiring book, which is bound to have a stimulating effect on the mind of the reader. It gives the life stories of seventeen men and women who had one quality in common, an incincible courage against great odds. They labored under handicaps apparently unsurmountable, but they conquered with unparalleled determination of purpose and a most steadfast faith. Some of them are already world-famous figures; others are as yet little known beyond a small circle. Dr. Grenfell of Labrador, Kagawa of Japan, Albert Schweitzer of Lambarene, and Sundar Singh are the leaders in the "famous" class.

Imagine the boldness of Kagawa when during the Sino-Japanese conflict he wrote to the Christians in Shantung: "I want to ask your pardon for my nation. Because of what we are doing in China I cannot preach in the name of Christ. But we Japanese Christians were bitterly opposed to it. Therefore pardon us, and pardon me especially, because our Christian forces were not strong enough to get the victory over the militarists."

The world pays tribute to *Albert Schweitzer*, who sacrificed a brilliant career to go out as a "poor negro's doctor" to minister to those who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death. Why did he do it? He explains it himself. "We and our civilization," he says, "are burdened with a great debt to the colored races. Anything we give them is not benevolence, but *atonement.* For every one who scattered injury some one ought to go out to take help, and when we have done all that is in our power we shall not have atoned for the thousandth part of our guilt."

The author gives a fascinating account of *Sundar Singh's* strange life, under the title, "The Man Who Disappeared." Born the son of a noble Sikh family (in 1889), which was fanatically opposed to Western civilization, he sought holiness of life with all his might. He could not find it. "With thought of suicide he retired to his own room one

night to await his last dawn. But before its light flooded his room the darkness was dispersed by a bright cloud, out of which it seemed to him that a voice spoke in tender remonstrance and a face appeared radiant with love." So belief in Christ of whom he had heard in the mission school, was born in him, never to die, and from that moment the spirit of Sundar Singh was a different spirit. His family turned against him; his father disowned him; they even tried to poison him. In violent pain he turned to the Christians for help. The doctor pronounced the case hopeless. But the boy—for he was only seventeen—asked God for life, and he lived. His subsequent career was so extraordinary, there were so many apparently miraculous experiences, visions and voices that one is apt to wonder what to think of it. But Paul had visions and heard voices, why should not this son of the Orient have similar things to tell?

He became a Sadhu, a Holy Man, and in time not only India but England and America came under the spell of his deeply spiritual personality. One of the strangest incidents is his journey to Tibet, where he desired to find an entrance for the gospel. He was cast into the depths of a well, of which the top was sealed down on him and left to die. On the third night he was rescued in a mysterious manner.

From Tibet he returned to the place of his childhood and to his exceedingly great joy his father became a Christian. He went to Tibet again and, finally, disappeared from view. Nothing certain can be said about his fate. He may have been lost in the jungle or in the snows or have abandoned the world for the solitude of a hermit's cave. "Like Moses he disappeared from our midst and ken, his message delivered, his work accomplished, his spirit satisfied."

Of the many in the book of whom the world as yet knows little, the most distinguished we think, is *Father Jackson*, the "Blind Leader of the Blind." Losing his sight as an infant, he nevertheless got all the education and took part in all the activities of a normal boy; was finally ordained an Anglican priest and went to Burma to care for the blind, establishing schools for blind boys and doing other rescue work. "His was the faith that moves mountains and performs daily miracles. He seemingly violated every physical law which man has discovered or erected for his protection and came to no harm. He went out hatless beneath the burning tropical sun; he walked barefoot and trod on poisonous snakes, but they wriggled away without biting him, and when reproached for his lack of care he merely smiled and retorted, 'Behold I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions and nothing shall by any means hurt you'."

He died of cancer fourteen years after his first voyage East, prematurely but after having done alone the work of ten seeing men. He had not cared for himself sufficiently to save his own life.

These specimens will convince our readers that this is a most unusual book, with a fascinating story in every chapter, many of them stranger than fiction and all of them happening not in the credulous past, but in the full light of our critical age.

The Teaching of Jesus on Human Relations, by *John S. Hoyland.* (Adapted for Use in America by Mary De Bardeleben.) Nashville, Tenn., Cokesburg Press, 1930. 157 pages.

This book was originally written for Englishmen, but afterwards—as it says in the subtitle—adapted for use in America. The social relations the author was thinking of more than any others, were those of Englishmen and Indians, and in the task of adaptation to American readers, the relations between white and colored people were drawn into the circle of discussions. The question that is always in the back of the mind of the writer is, Where can we get a spiritual force that enables us to overcome the barriers of racialism and nationalism and make relations between races—especially a dominant and a subject race—just, wholesome and kind?

There is so much that separates races. With great skill and consummate understanding the writer discusses the things that make a natural intercourse hard. Religion should unite and bring together nations as well as individuals. But history tells us what horrible crimes against others have been committed in the name of religion. A striking instance is quoted of Cromwell who reports a terrible massacre of thousands of Irishmen and adds piously: "And to God alone is the glory!" Politics is another factor making for estrangement. Even education complicates matters. After people have acquired a certain amount of education they become self-conscious and it becomes harder to lord it over them. A different culture is a great and real barrier. "East and West will never meet," they say, and there is a great deal of truth in it. Even the study of history has a bad effect on people. It tells them of the divisions, conflicts and injustices of the past and so keeps hostile feelings alive that would otherwise lie dormant or disappear entirely.

Now the writer takes up his task positively. Where do we find the resources adequate to the solution of our great problem? Naturally he thinks of the Christian faith and the Old and New Testament. The Jews in the Old Testament considered themselves the chosen people of God and developed a racial pride that was odious to God and men. The author shows beautifully how this pride receives a sharp denunciation in the book of Jonah. The great prophets try to bring it home to the people that Jehovah is the God of all the world and that those who live righteous lives are acceptable to him. Israel did not learn this lesson, and when Jesus came they wanted him to carry their proud dreams to realization. He refused and was crucified for it.

The author portrays attractively the great and leading convictions of Jesus' life, his faith in the fatherhood of God and his love for man, God's child. This faith in God was the great source of strength in his life. His mission was to bear witness of the true God before the people and so to advance God's kingdom. Saints and sinners, Jews, Gentiles and Samaritans had an equal claim upon his affection. With these convictions we must go out into the world and win the hearts for God and his kingdom. Violence is anti-Christian. Jesus chose the Cross, not the sword.

The author knows that the gospel of Jesus today is on trial as to its social application. Jesus himself thought more of the Christianizing of the individual. Christians, in order to succeed in their task, must have the characteristics of the men of the kingdom, as pictured in Matthew 5: they must be poor in spirit, meek, hunger and thirst after righteousness, merciful, etc.

All this the writer discusses very aptly and even convincingly. But we can't get away from the feeling that such perfectionism is a little too high for ordinary mortals. Who is sufficient for these things? we say with Paul. Yes, Paul was, and a few choice souls. But the general rank and file of Christians are not. And what shall happen in the meantime while we are waiting and, perhaps, striving for perfection? The social machine cannot stop. Laws will have to be made, issues to be settled, political demands will require action. And compromises will be the order of the day.

The book has strong features. The writer is a man of insight, of high ideals and great persuasiveness. But as a guide in the practical solution of the race problem his book has but little immediate helpfulness.